"The Golden Calf vs. The Image of Man: Liberating the Spirit from the Religious Establishment"

Modern ethics faces a root paradox: monotheistic religions, which claim to be an eternal moral beacon, have largely become a source of intellectual paralysis and alienation. The problem is not merely their disconnection from the values of the generation, but the shocking and persistent contradiction between the messages of God and the cruelty and corruption that have become the institutionalized norm within the religious institutions themselves.

A deep examination of the foundational texts—the Bible, the Quran, and the New Testament—reveals the unsettling truth: these are texts that contain within them, throughout their entire length, elements of cruelty and institutionalized corruption, which fundamentally negate the dogmatic narrative they claim to represent. The purpose of this essay is to tear the mask off this paradox, to expose the silenced voices within these texts, and to establish a new conception of morality based on human reason, while denouncing the power-mongering and corruption that have taken over human life in the name of the heavens.

We shall begin with Judaism and what is implied in the Torah of Israel.

The moral analysis of the figure of Phinehas son of Eleazar requires us to look beyond the sacred halo associated with his name, and to examine the defining

events of his life through a prism of ethical and rational criticism, as required in this foundational document.

The act in Shittim: Justice ?

If that is not enough, let us take a quick jump to the institution of the priesthood. The institution of the priesthood as it is depicted in the biblical text does not represent spiritual leadership, but a system of economic and social takeover. The priests are described as a class detached from productive human creation, existing as a parasite on the body of the public. Under a veneer of worship, whose roots are planted deep in Canaanite pagan practices, the priests received a huge share of the finest agricultural produce – meat, wine, oil, and quality fruits – while appropriating the fruits of others' labor under the guise of a divine command.

This phenomenon holds up an ugly mirror to the aspiration for values: when the office of the priesthood becomes a source of personal welfare on the backs of society, it is emptied of all human content. The history of the priesthood – as reflected in the stories of the sons of Eli the priest, who lay with the women in the Tent of Meeting – constitutes conclusive proof of the absolute detachment between religious office and human values. There is no service for the public good here, but rather a powerful mechanism that preserves its status by investing the best material resources in those who contribute nothing to society other than fulfilling a ritual role. This is an inherent moral failure: the religious system sanctifies this parasitic class, thereby granting legitimacy to corruption as an institutionalized way of life.

The criticism voiced here does not grow out of anti-religious circles or from secular motives, but stems from a deep and pure commitment to religious inquiry.

Does the question of commitment to the biblical text entail blind agreement or necessitate active resistance? – This is an age-old bone of contention, over which many quills have been broken. Throughout the generations, the battle was decided in favor of the far-reaching

interpretive approach of Rabbi Akiva, which in many respects eclipsed the path of Rabbi Ishmael, which adhered to the plain meaning and the reality of the text. However, modern thought that seeks to subordinate the values of this generation to interpretations from the past is nothing but anti-religious ideology in disguise. It is a conception that sanctifies the medium – the text itself – and idolizes it at the expense of moral and rational essence. The insistence on binding human consciousness to interpretations from the past is not an act of fear of heaven, but a move intended to establish the text as a supreme authority that annuls private conscience. For us, the essence precedes the written, and any attempt to turn traditional interpretation into an absolute decree is nothing but an act of intellectual suppression, which seeks to sacrifice human truth on the altar of the pagan "dogma."

The story of Amalek places the reader before a harrowing moral dilemma, in which a command for genocide receives absolute religious endorsement. There is no war here in the political or military sense, but an assimilation of wickedness as a religious value: the implied message is that total and brutal extermination is not just a necessity of the hour, but a heavenly will. In doing so, the Torah turns the most brutal cruelty into a binding religious command.

Anyone who holds a true religious commitment, one that seeks the image of God in the values of justice and life, cannot agree with a narrative that grants divine approval to genocide. The instruction to blot out the memory of a nation does not stand the test of human morality, and the attempt to cloak it in the garb of "holiness" only exacerbates the moral sin. For us, loyalty to God utterly rejects participation in this narrative; disagreement with this command is not heresy, but an expression of loyalty to the value of life that stands above any pagan dogma, which seeks to validate the unforgivable. Resistance here is the very religious commitment.

From the analyses brought thus far, and from what emerges in the coming chapters of this document, an inevitable picture becomes clear: the Torah as a text is a complex and contradictory human creation. It is not one cohesive piece, but a constant struggle between two opposing trends: on one hand, a trend of commitment to moral and rational essence; and on the other, a system of foreign interests, lust for power, predatory nationalism, and political motives.

The biblical text preserves within it, to this very day, those destructive human motifs for which we, as a human society, continue to pay a heavy price. The exposure of these motives is not an act of destruction, but an act of cleansing: it allows us to separate between the moral truth we seek to serve, and the manipulative mechanisms designed to fortify rule, status, and power on the backs of the weak. This understanding is the cornerstone on the path to reconnecting with human values liberated from the shackles of pagan dogma.

Beyond the institutional attempt to present the Torah as an eternal instruction manual, the complex truth is revealed to our eyes: the Torah does not act as a repository of final answers, but as an active mechanism of awakening, wondering, and constant questioning.

Moreover, it seems that the biblical text deliberately embedded elements that invite sharp criticism of themselves. Whoever sees in these texts a ready-made solution to the dilemmas of life misses the deepest narrative: the Torah seeks to place the reader in front of the mirror, to confront him with the cruelty and power-mongering inherent in the actions of the biblical characters, and to force upon him the work of moral inquiry.

The accepted reading, which searches the written word for "answers," is in fact a missing of the mark. These texts are not intended to quiet the conscience, but to disturb it. They are designed to provoke a counter-reaction, to force the reader to dissent, to criticize, and to choose a different path – a path that examines human essence against

the dogmatic narratives that seek to control it. Whoever looks for moral comfort in the text misses the fact that the text itself demands that we fight it, denounce its failures, and define our moral truth from within the ruins of the violence it places before us. Dissent, criticism, and sometimes even agreement – all these are the religious act that brings essential religious commitment to expression.

A clear example of the "hidden" intentions of the Torah of Israel – hidden not in the magical or mystical sense, but in the rational-essential sense – are the instructions regarding slavery. While many texts in the biblical system deal with regulating the status of the slave as part of the reality of the period, the Torah embeds within it a far-reaching human starting point: "You shall not hand over a slave to his master." From a critical perspective, this is not just a legal instruction, but an active call that gives the slave the power.

to take his fate into his own hands and escape. This is a defiance of human ownership, and a dismantling of the institution of slavery from within.

However, throughout the generations and even in our own time, commentators have emerged who sought to turn the tables. Under a veneer of textual adherence, there are circles that appropriate the laws of the slave in order to legitimize, and even mandate, holding human beings against their will. We thought that in the modern era, human society had shed these distorted interpretations, but it is becoming clear before our eyes that there are broad circles that do not see slavery – or any other human oppression – as an absolute prohibition, but as a tool of service in the name of "religion."

We have been witness in recent years to alarming processes of regression: an attempt to reconstruct ancient, predatory values in the name of religion, while completely distorting the sources. The truth is that there is absolutely no connection between these conceptions and the essence of the Torah of Israel. The aspiration for freedom and human dignity, reflected in the abolition of slavery inherent in the text, is the true moral imperative. Any attempt to harness religion to the service of oppression is nothing but a cynical exploitation of the text, which expresses commitment to the interests of power and not to the sacred human conscience.

In later periods, such as the Hellenistic period, we encountered writers who sought to cast the figure of Moses into molds of powerful and authoritarian leadership. Stories such as the command to wield a sword against "the brothers" after the sin of the Golden Calf are not accidental; they represent an attempt by certain schools to turn religious leadership into a police force of thoughts and beliefs. These writers, who sought to fortify their institutional rule, distorted the figure of Moses and turned him from a complex and patient figure into a figure of a tyrant who uses violence to impose uniformity.

However, this school intentionally ignores – or perhaps fears – the biblical narratives that present radical openness. It is enough to look at the figure of Gideon son of Joash, who conducts a dialogue of doubt, questioning, and even heresy before the divinity, to understand that the text does not seek blind obedience. Gideon is proof that the scripture preserves within it, alongside the power-mongering, also voices of freedom of thought and de facto atheism.

This gap is the key: the later establishment sought to erase Gideon, to silence the skeptics, and to turn Moses into the protector of thought-dictatorship. We, from our commitment to the original essence of the text, reject this powerful interpretation. We identify the "thought police" as a later and foreign addition to the biblical spirit, and prefer to cling to those moments of openness and freedom – like the story of Gideon – which testify that the source is rational, human, and encourages questioning far more than it encourages obedience.

In the Book of II Samuel, chapter 8, verse 2, a chilling moment of institutionalized bloodshed is revealed: "And he smote Moab, and measured them with a line, making them to lie down on the ground; and he measured two lines to put to death, and one full line to keep alive." This is not merely a "military operation," but a dry and cold description of a distinct war crime, committed by the one who is known in tradition as the "sweet singer of Israel."

The text does not present the act as a sin requiring atonement, but as a historical fact laid before us. This is precisely where the moral claim lies: the question is not directed at the "values of the modern generation," which are easy for us to label as more advanced, but at the values of the religious system itself—at the twenty-four holy books, and at the religious person seeking to find truth within them.

The religious person stands before this text in complete confusion: does the figure of David, as described in the Bible, align with divine morality, or does the Bible reveal to us a flesh-and-blood human, violent and unrestrained, who is also subject to human power structures? The silence of the text in the face of the crime is further proof that the Torah does not give us absolute moral confirmation, but sets up a mirror. Anyone who acknowledges the sanctity of the scriptures is required to ask themselves: are they loyal to the "sweet

singer" who chose to kill with the method of the line, or are they loyal to the value of life and justice? Ignoring this crime in the name of the "sanctity of the text" is the true heresy against human essence, while placing the act at the center of criticism is the most important essential-religious act.

"And David left neither man nor woman alive, to bring tidings to Gath, saying, Lest they should tell on us, saying, So did David..." (I Samuel 27:11).

Why is this considered a distinct war crime?

1. **"No witnesses" policy: David destroys the entire population—men, women, and children—not out of a military necessity of defense, but out of a cold tactical consideration: to prevent them from telling Achish that he is not attacking his own people (Israel), but other nations.**
2. **Strategic deception: David lies to Achish time after time, reporting that he is raiding areas in the Negev that belong to Judah or their allies, while in practice he is massacring the inhabitants of the area and performing ethnic cleansing to cover his tracks.**
3. **Lack of moral consideration: There is no "commanded war" here, and there is no self-defense. There is personal political survival carried out through the systematic liquidation of helpless civilian populations.**

The moral view of the text Similar to the other acts of violence you mentioned, here too the Bible relates the facts without censorship, but also without moralizing. It describes David as a very gray figure:

- **The King as a murderer: The modern reader sees here a "war crime" in our terms (killing civilians to prevent testimony). The text, however, sees this as a description of a figure who operates within a world of survival wars.**
- **Biblical silence: The Bible does not try to say that David was "right." It simply presents David as someone capable of doing the most extreme acts to ensure his survival and his arrival at the throne.**

How should this be treated? When we read this chapter, we understand that David was not a "hero of children's books." He was a military leader who operated in a brutal political reality, and by today's standards, his actions would stand in every measure of crimes against humanity.

The fact that the Bible chose to preserve this information—that David massacred all the prisoners so that no one would "reveal" his secret to Achish—is the best proof that the text does not try to turn David into an angel. It describes a king, with all the cruelty that entailed in those days.

It is important to clarify: this document does not presume to set foundations or replace one dogma with another. Its goal is one and unique—to mandate

discussion. We seek to break the cycle of blind obedience and set in its place a table for deep inquiry, where the text is not an automatic authority, but an object of wondering. There is no pretension here to own the truth, but a pretension to awaken the human duty to wonder, to examine, and to place every command—as ancient and holy as it may be—under the magnifying glass of morality and reason. Anyone who reads this and searches for a leader or finished answers will be disappointed; anyone who searches for a partner in a journey of uncompromising religious inquiry will find here the space to do so.

1. **The law of the "stubborn and rebellious son" – does the system sanctify deterrence at the expense of life? According to the Mishnah (tractate Sanhedrin), this concerns a child who has gone astray, and the *halakha* details a complex process that ends in execution. The Sages themselves admitted to a large extent that "it never happened and never will" and it was intended only "to expound and receive reward." In a tone of inquiry: even if the Sages sought to "emasculate" the law in practice, the very existence of a text that grants theoretical legitimacy to parents to bring their son to court to be executed is a mechanism that places parental and religious authority above the value of life. The fact that the law was preserved as a "teaching" testifies to the way the system prefers to preserve the power to command death rather than to erase entirely every narrative that permits harm to offspring.**
2. **The law of the "pursuer" (*rodef*) and intervention in bodily autonomy Talmudic law determines that it is permissible to save the pursued by harming the pursuer, even to the point of killing him. So far, defensive logic. However, in certain situations, the expansion of the definition of "pursuer" became a social and gender-based tool. In a tone of inquiry: when the system interprets concepts like "desecration of God's name" or harm to religious norms as a form of "pursuit," it grants excess power to the individual or group to take the law into their own hands. The moral question is: has this law become over time a cloak for the use of violence against someone who deviates from the norm? Turning a person into a "pursuer" is an easy way to cancel their basic right to legal protection.**
3. **"The Sages annulled the betrothal" (*Afki'nhu rabbanan lekiddushin*) – the power of the system over personal status**

The concept of *"Afki'nhu rabbanan lekiddushin"* (the Sages retroactively nullified a marriage) presents an immense power in the hands of the Sages—the ability to erase an individual's legal status retroactively. In a tone of inquiry: on one hand, this sounds like a humanitarian solution to women's distress. On the other, it is a distinct expression of absolute power. The system cancels the individual's autonomy to determine their own fate and

ascribes to itself divine authority to rewrite reality. The question here is not whether the solution is "good," but whether the very existence of such power—which allows the Sages to annul human reality—is a mechanism that fortifies the law of "Shabbat" as a supreme value over human life—the moral dissonance.

The Talmud (Yoma 85a) posits the principle "Saving a life overrides Shabbat." On the face of it, this is a tremendous moral leap forward. But let us examine it in depth:

- **The moral problem: The fact that a halakhic "permission" is needed to save a life indicates that the textual holiness (Shabbat) was fundamentally perceived as higher than life itself.**
- **Our analysis: The religious system created a paradox where life is not a holy value in itself, but is conditional upon a "halakhic debate." In the spirit of our foundational document, we cannot accept a conception in which human life requires "approval" from the text to be worthy of saving. This is a clear example of the idolatry of the text over human essence—the premise that the text is the source of authority for life, rather than life itself being the source of all morality.**

Rule of the Sages over individual freedom. Imagine a Jew walking along a stream on a Saturday morning, who suddenly hears a cry for help; a child, not of his own people, is drowning in the river waters. Shall he stand aside, ask himself for a few minutes for a complex halakhic inquiry, and at the end say to the child: "Pardon me, I am not permitted"?

This image is not just a parable; it is an indictment. In a situation where natural human morality cries out for action, the religious system has erected a partition of "inquiry." The reality in which a person is required to have halakhic permission to save a life reveals the depth of the fracture: the Torah, as mediated by the establishment, has turned from a beacon of life into a barrier separating man from his most basic human duty.

When we examine this, it becomes clear that the Halakha in this case does not come to serve life, but to place the "holiness" of the day of rest above the value of existence. The question is not "what does the Halakha say," but "what kind of morality requires us to reflect before saving a human being." The very existence of this question, and the very fact that someone might stop and think instead of jumping into the water, is evidence of the moral deviation we are investigating. This is the true moment of testing: are we slaves to a system that has set distorted priorities, or are we loyal to the value of life that precedes every human or textual command? He who chooses to save a life without hesitation is the one who expresses the essential religious

commitment—the one that sees in the human image the supreme commandment that needs no external permission.

Here is an exact formulation of this argument, which dismantles the attempt to cancel individual moral commitment in the name of objective "religion":

Opposing dogmatic positions such as those of Prof. Leibowitz, which seek to detach the religious act from human conscience and set it up as mere technical obedience, we put forward a sharp statement: this distinction is an illusion. There is not a single person in existence—be they religious or secular—who makes value-based decisions detached from their personal conscience.

The attempt to present obedience to Halakha as an "objective" action detached from moral judgment is an attempt to disguise the fact that every interpretation of the Torah of Israel, without exception, is nothing but a projection of subjective conscientious and moral perceptions. When a person chooses to fulfill one commandment or another, or to decide on a complex halakhic issue, they are not performing a pure "divine command," but are subjecting the text to the command of their personal conscience, even if they try to hide behind high-minded words about "the nullification of man's wThe moral problem: Instead of viewing the conquest of a woman in war as a war crime (as we understand it today), the system created a "halakhic path" that allows this exploitation under a religious guise.

- **Our analysis: The attempt to "soften" the act through technical laws is a deception. The very fact that there is a "law" for capturing women indicates that the supreme value of the system was not the protection of the weak, but the preservation of the soldier's power. ill."**

Therefore, every religious person is, necessarily, a servant of their own conscience. The only difference between us and those who boast of "service to God" is honesty: we openly admit the conscientious consideration that guides us, while they try to attribute their conscience to God in order to evade personal responsibility—"and the rest, go and learn": he who denies this fundamental fact not only misleads the public but denies the essence of human freedom and the moral duty of man to choose the good out of recognition, and not out of perceived slavery to a text.

When we read the words of the Sages without institutional fear, passages are revealed that place the religious person before a moral abyss. Here are two more controversial issues, which illustrate how the system gave legitimacy to values that require us today to offer fierce resistance:

1. **"Canaanite Slave" – Turning man into an object in the legal system The Mishnah and Talmud discuss at length the status of the "Canaanite slave" (non-Jewish). According to Halakha, a Canaanite slave is property in every respect of his master, almost like an animal or an object.**

- **The moral problem: The religious system not only accepted slavery as a "historical fact," but created an elaborate legal framework intended to fix this ownership. The Talmud (tractate Kiddushin) discusses the question of how a person buys a slave, as if it were a normal commercial transaction.**
- **Our analysis: This is clear evidence of the way in which halakhic thought gave a "divine seal of approval" to deep human inequality. The claim that "that was the custom then" is insufficient; the system chose to anchor slavery as part of the sacred divine order. As we examine this, we are required to ask: can the system that saw slavery as a halakhic value be a source of universal morality? The clear answer is that a separation between "halakhic text" and "human morality" is necessary here; otherwise, we lose our human image.**

"The Beautifully Captive Woman" (*Yefat Toar*) – Legitimation for War and Exploitation

In tractate Kiddushin and in the Midrashim, the Sages interpret the law of the "beautifully captive woman" (from the Torah). According to the plain meaning, this is a permit for a soldier to take a woman who has fallen into war captivity and have relations with her. Although the Sages added caveats (such as the time one must wait), they gave halakhic validity to the act of conquest and the exploitation of a woman's body.

- **We stand before these pages of the Gemara and must declare: this is a moral distortion that has no place in a healthy human conscience. One cannot intertwine the concept of "holiness" with legitimation for the abandonment of a woman's body in war.**
- **These examples are not isolated cases, but a method. Every time the Torah or the Sages stood before a social injustice, they often preferred "the halakhic order" over "human justice." This discussion compels us to say without hesitation: any law that sanctifies ownership of a person or the exploitation of a woman is a law that expresses the limitations of the writers and the power-perceptions of the era, and not the will of God.**

When we examine the Bible, a deep paradox is revealed: the sacred worship in the Temple, which includes the cherubim—creatures with wings having a distinct mythological character—is perceived as worship of the one God. In contrast, the calf worship of Jeroboam son of Nebat, which also intended to manifest a divine presence, is denounced as a terrible sin and "idolatry."

From a textual perspective, there is no essential difference at the ritual level; both cases place physical means as an intermediary between man and the divinity. If so, from where does the authority to reject Jeroboam's worship derive? The answer does not lie in "religious truth" or the quality of the God, but in a political-institutional interest:

1. **Struggle over the centralization of power: The Bible represents the interest of the House of David and Jerusalem. The calf worship in Bethel and Dan was a real threat to the legitimacy of the Temple in Jerusalem. "Truth" was determined by the question of where one sacrifices, not what one sacrifices.**
2. **Defining the "Other" as idolatrous: The establishment in Jerusalem needed a religious enemy to fortify its identity. Vilifying Jeroboam's worship as "idolatry" was an effective propaganda tool for justifying the rejection of the Northern Kingdom. The text turns the ritual difference into a holy war to prevent the creation of religious alternatives.**
3. **The illusion of "pure worship": The attempt to present the cherubim as less "idolatrous" than the calves is an act of interpretive manipulation. Both cases are expressions of a human desire to embody the abstract. The rejection of calf worship is evidence that religious authority in the Bible is not driven by divine considerations, but by considerations of control and differentiation.**

Our inquiry reveals that worship is not a matter of truth versus falsehood, but a matter of authority versus subversion. The moment we understand this, we are freed from the need to accept the "truth" that the Bible forces upon us. We understand that the text attributes truth to its own worship not because it is more exalted, but because it is the worship of the "winners."

The Bible reflects a patriarchal society in which the status of children, and especially daughters, was often that of "property" or players within family and political power games. Below are several prominent cases:

1. **The captives in the wars (Book of Numbers 31) After the war in Midian, Moses commands to kill all the males and all the women who have known a man by lying with him, but he explicitly instructs: "But all the young girls who have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves."**
    - **The clash: The text describes an army taking minors (girls) as war spoils. Although the Bible does not specify their immediate sexual fate, the context is clear—they were taken into the possession of the soldiers. From a modern moral perspective, this is systematic sexual exploitation of minors under the protection of military and religious law.**

2. **Lot's daughters in Sodom (Book of Genesis 19) When the men of Sodom surround Lot's house and demand he bring out his guests so they may "know them" (i.e., rape them), Lot offers them in return: "See now, I have two daughters who have not known a man; please, let me bring them out to you, and do to them as you please."**
    - **The clash: Lot offers his minor daughters to an angry mob to save his guests. The text describes this as an action of Lot, who is defined as "righteous" (in the limited biblical sense), without condemning him for the shocking sacrifice of his daughters. The moral silence here is chilling, as it positions the daughters as tools for satisfying a mob, not as human entities with rights.**
3. **The rape of Dinah (Book of Genesis 34) Dinah, Jacob's daughter, goes out "to see the daughters of the land" and is raped by Shechem son of Hamor. While the discussion surrounding the act focuses on the revenge of Simeon and Levi and the marriage agreement, the voice of Dinah almost completely disappears from the story. The text focuses on the "insult" caused to her father and brothers, and not on the girl's personal trauma.**

How should we view this?

1. **Absence of "children's rights": In the ancient world where the Bible was written, the concept of a "child" or "minor" as a protected subject did not exist as it does today. Girls were often considered as having potential for procreation or as family assets.**
2. **Political use of women and children: These stories emphasize the fact that within a patriarchal society, men used women and minors as "currency" (as with Lot) or as spoils (as in the desert).**
3. **The reader's responsibility: Similar to what we discussed earlier—the Bible does not present these acts as "pedophilia" (a modern concept), but as part of normative social conduct at the time. The text does not pretend to be a universal book of morality that "sees" children. It describes reality as it was perceived by the male authors of antiquity.**

Islam

To analyze Islam as a system of thought, law, and worship from a critical and academic perspective, we must examine its conceptual and practical structure, which is often perceived as conflicting with modern universal moral principles. This analysis will focus on points where the foundational texts and the halakhic tradition (the Sharia) pose radical ethical challenges.

We shall begin with the first matter.

1. The concept of military "Jihad" as a foundational religious value One of the most complex moral challenges in Islam is the ontological status of Jihad. While in modern apologetic discourse it is sometimes argued that this is an "inner struggle" or a concept equivalent to "self-defense," textual and historical-halakhic analysis indicates that Jihad—in its meaning as armed warfare to spread Islamic sovereignty—is a pillar of classical thought.

The radical moral problem: The moral difficulty lies in turning armed violence into a legitimate political-religious tool, and sometimes even into a duty imposed upon the community (the *Ummah*). The dichotomy created between *Dar al-Islam* (House of Islam) and *Dar al-Harb* (House of War) creates a situation where universal human morality—which recognizes the right of human beings to live their lives without religious or military coercion—is pushed aside in favor of the divine command that grants the Islamic leadership the authority to use force to expand its influence.

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **Interpretation of "Naskh" (Abrogation): As mentioned, the doctrine of abrogation grants decisive weight to the later Medinan texts of the Prophet (such as Surah at-Tawbah), which adopt a more militant approach than the earlier verses. Ethically, this neutralizes the ability to use pluralistic principles as a solid interpretive basis.**
- **Definition of "The Infidel" (Kafir): The religious structure creates a human hierarchy where the "infidel" (or a believer who is not Muslim) does not have equal status to a Muslim. From a modern moral perspective, this is a lack of basic equality that constitutes a basis for structural discrimination, since the right to life and security is conditional upon religious status or the status of a *Dhimmi* (protected person).**

The determination that war is a legitimate means for promoting the faith is not just a historical anomaly, but an ideological principle that places theological-political interest above the sacred value of human life, regardless of one's faith.

To delve into the concept of Jihad from a critical-academic perspective, we must examine the mechanism through which the religious text "neutralizes" universal morality and replaces it with political-theological morality.

Deepening: The Mechanism of "Legitimization of Violence"

The radical moral problem is not just the mere existence of warfare—after all, most religions and ideologies have known wars—but in the institutional structure that Islam created around Jihad.

1. The Detachment from the Individual Value In modern morality, we assume that there are natural human rights that do not depend on group affiliation. In contrast, classical Islamic thought (the *Fiqh*, jurisprudence) divides the world according to religious-political affiliation.

- **Moral Implication: A person defined as a *Kafir* (infidel) does not enjoy the same level of protection for his life and property as a Muslim does. When the doctrine of Jihad determines that the goal of the fighting is "raising the word of God" (*I'la' Kalimat Allah*), it allows religious and political leaders to justify harming civilians under the pretext of "divine justice."**

2. Turning Cognitive Dissonance into a Legal System Modern scholars of Islam point out that the classical texts created a "space of action" that is broad and unlimited for the fighters.

- **The concept of "Ghanima" (Spoils): The halakhic/jurisprudential discussion of "spoils" (property, women, lands) is not just technical. It reflects a perception in which military conflict is also profitable on the material and sexual level. The moral problem is that the religious text does not condemn this, but grants it an orderly legal framework. By doing so, the "other" inherently becomes an "object" (property), which makes the commission of cruel acts easier psychologically and morally.**

3. The Failure of "Limited Universality" The central academic claim is that Islam purports to be a universal religion, but it does so via a path of totalitarian universalism.

- **The Contradiction: On one hand, Islam strives to apply its laws to all of humanity (because this is the "correct order"), and on the other hand, the way to arrive at this is via *Dar al-Harb*—a state of constant conflict.**
- **The Result: A morality that is not based on consent or a social contract between equals, but on subjugation. Once a society adopts a perception where "justice" is the application of religious laws to everyone, any resistance to religion is perceived as "injustice" (*Zulm*), which gives moral legitimacy to violence against opponents.**

4. The Gap between Modern Reality and the Text The greatest conflict today is between the desire of many Muslims to live in peace with their neighbors and the canonical texts that are still taught in religious institutions.

- **The Problem: As long as these texts (which command war against "infidels") remain in force as the unchanging word of God, any attempt at humanistic interpretation will encounter a wall of "heresy." This is a**

radical moral problem, because it prevents the community's ability to change and update its values without dismantling its own foundations.

Summing up the deepening: Jihad is not a "glitch" in Islam, but an integral mechanism designed to solve the tension between faith and the reality of a world that does not submit to God's authority. The moral problem is that this mechanism sacrifices the autonomy and life of the individual on the altar of religious control.

2. The Law of "Riddah" (Apostasy/Leaving Islam) and the Absence of Freedom of Conscience One of the essential characteristics of modern universal morality is the right to freedom of religion, which includes the right to change one's religion, to leave religion, or to be non-religious (atheist/agnostic). In Islam, this issue encounters a rigid halakhic and moral barrier.

The radical moral problem: The law of "Riddah" (from Arabic: *irtidad* - withdrawal/deviation) decrees that a Muslim who leaves Islam is to be sentenced to death. Morally, this is a denial of the most basic freedom of the individual: the freedom of their own thought and belief. When a religion forbids its abandonment under physical threat, it ceases to be "faith" (chosen by a person's free will) and becomes an "ideological prison."

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **Legal sources: This law does not appear explicitly in the Quran as a death penalty (although the Quran threatens divine punishment in the afterlife), but is based on *Hadith* traditions (sayings of the Prophet) attributed to Muhammad, such as: "Whoever changes his religion – kill him." The reliance on the Hadith as a basis for binding legislation makes it very difficult for Islamic reformers to abolish the punishment, as doing so constitutes a challenge to the authority of the Prophet's own words.**
- **Political-social significance: Riddah is perceived in Islamic thought not only as a religious offense but as high treason. In a structure where the religious community and the state are one entity, leaving the religion is a dismantling of the social order. This is a totalitarian conception in which the individual is not their own master, but a cog in the religious-political machine.**
- **Implications for modern society: In countries where Sharia is the basis of the law (such as Saudi Arabia, Iran, or Afghanistan), the law of Riddah serves as a tool for suppressing political opponents, intellectuals, and freedom of expression. The struggle of Muslim human rights activists always encounters this wall: how can one argue for equality and democracy when the very act of free thought is considered a deviation punishable by death?**

The moral difficulty here is twofold:

1. **Violence against the individual: The system actively works to physically eliminate a person solely on the basis of a change in their intellectual perception.**
2. **Intellectual stagnation: The prohibition on Riddah creates a tremendous "chilling effect" on any attempt at criticism, research, or reform. The religion preserves its power not through persuasion, but through fear and terror of punitive actions.**

This is a subject that highlights the abysmal gap between religion as a "way of life" and religion as a "system of control."

To illustrate the depth of the moral scandal involved in the institution of *Sariyyah* (sex slavery) and enslavement in classical and halakhic Islam, we must look at the texts themselves and the classical interpretation, which do not attempt to beautify reality, but regulate it as a legal code. Here are examples that give expression to this exploitation:

1. The "consent" of the captive and the authority of ownership One of the most disturbing discussions in the books of *Fiqh* (jurisprudence) deals with the question of when it is permissible for a master to have relations with his slave who was taken captive.

- **The shocking example: The Halakha distinguishes between a slave who is "pagan" and one who is "People of the Book" (Christian or Jewish). Regarding a slave taken in war (such as in the Prophet's wars in Khaybar), the Halakha determines that the master may have relations with her after *istibra*—a waiting period of one menstrual cycle to ensure she is not pregnant by a previous master.**
- **The moral scandal: The term "consent" does not exist in the equation. Once the woman is defined as "property" (spoils), she loses her right to her own body. These texts discuss the technique of exploitation as if it were a normal commercial transaction, while completely ignoring the mental and physical trauma of the conquered woman.**

2. The case of Safiyya bint Huyayy The story of Safiyya bint Huyayy, one of Muhammad's wives, is a vivid example of this reality that is sometimes used as a religious "model":

- **The description: Safiyya was the daughter of a Jewish leader in Khaybar. In the war, her father, husband, and brother were killed by Muhammad's army. She was taken captive. Instead of remaining a slave, Muhammad chose her as a partner (after freeing her from her slavery so that she could marry him).**

- **The scandal: Islamic tradition presents this as "grace." But from a radical moral perspective, this is a reality in which a warlord chooses a woman for himself from a pile of captives who have just been orphaned of their entire family. The fact that tradition sees this as a legitimate and honorable act testifies that the perception of "woman as belonging to the victor" was a deep-seated norm that was not perceived as morally flawed.**

3. The precedent of "ISIS" for the classical sources The most shocking example in the modern era is the way in which ISIS (the Islamic State) justified the sexual enslavement of Yazidi women in 2014.

- **The argument: ISIS did not invent a new method. They issued official pamphlets based on classical jurisprudence books (such as those of the Hanbali school) in which it is explained exactly how it is permissible to buy, sell, and rape captives.**
- **The moral scandal: This is a moment when theory became brutal practice. These pamphlets show that once you accept the principle that "religion permits sexual enslavement as part of war," there is no mechanism within the system that can stop this cruelty. It proves that the problem is not just "radical interpretation," but the texts themselves that give legitimacy to such acts.**

4. The "right" to the slave in the case of a child A well-known law in Islam is the concept of *Umm al-Walad* ("mother of the child")—a slave who gives birth to a son for her master.

Implication: While this improves her status (she cannot be sold and is freed upon her master's death), it only underscores the fact that she was never a free person to begin with. The child belongs to the master, and the woman remains subject to a "master-property" system until the end of her life. This is a morality that anchors inequality as a permanent fact, with no way to escape objectification other than by bearing children for the master.

To delve even deeper into this moral scandal, we must look at how Islamic law (Sharia) not only enabled this exploitation but protected it through an elaborate system of rulings. To understand the depth of the scandal, we will examine three additional layers:

1. The absence of "rape" as a concept against "property" In the modern legal system, the constituent element of the crime of rape is the lack of consent. In classical Islamic jurisprudence, the concept of "rape" is generally defined in the context of a free woman (a Muslimah).

- **The scandal: Regarding a slave woman, the master is the owner of the "property" (*Yamin al-Milk*). Since he has the right to enjoy the slave's body as part of his ownership, legally, it is impossible to "rape" one's own slave. This is a chilling legal definition, because it nullifies the woman's personhood and turns her into an object that cannot refuse. This perception created a reality in which thousands of women throughout Islamic history were subjected to forced sexual exploitation that was perceived as perfectly "legal."**

2. "Waiting for the cycle" as an attempt at "moral order" One of the common apologetic arguments is that Islam "regulated" slavery and even established laws to protect women (such as *istibra*—waiting for a cycle before intercourse to ensure she is not pregnant).

- **Critical analysis: Modern academia views this as an attempt to "whitewash" sexual exploitation using legal technique. The requirement to wait a cycle is not intended to protect the woman's will, but to protect the master's "seed" (to ensure that the child born is his and not a previous master's). This is a law designed to serve the man's proprietary right over his offspring, not the woman's right to bodily integrity.**

3. Total alienation: Projecting "holiness" onto slavery The scandal takes on a more shocking dimension when one understands how the greatest Islamic thinkers treated this.

- **The example: In the writings of famous Quranic commentators (such as al-Tabari or Ibn Kathir), there is almost no expression of sorrow or moral criticism regarding the turning of women into sex slaves in slave markets. On the contrary, these texts discuss the subject in a neutral tone, as if it were a law of nature.**
- **Implication: The silence of religious thinkers and the transformation of sexual exploitation into the "word of God" is what prevents Islamic society from liberating itself from this burden. When you read in a sacred text that "God has permitted you your slave women," you receive divine approval for denying the humanity of the other.**

4. Can this change? The dilemma of reform The attempt by modern Muslims to say that "slavery is archaic and irrelevant" encounters a severe theological difficulty:

- **If Islam is an eternal religion, and the Quran states that God permitted slave women, how can one claim that it is forbidden today?**
- **The result: A vacuum is created. Instead of saying clearly: "These texts were cruel and wrong," the common strategy is evasion. This evasion leaves an opening for extremist organizations (like ISIS, Al-Qaeda, or**

radical groups in Africa) to use the original texts as a basis for contemporary practices.

4. The doctrine of "Naskh" (Abrogation) as a tool for moral stagnation One of the most complex intellectual and moral challenges in Islam is the doctrine of *Naskh wa Mansukh* (the abrogation and the abrogated). This is an interpretive mechanism that determines that certain verses in the Quran, which were revealed at a later stage in Muhammad's career, abrogate (*nasikh*) earlier verses (*mansukh*) that contradict them.

The radical moral problem: The use of this doctrine creates a "moral blockage." When there is a contradiction between peace-seeking and tolerant verses from the Meccan (early) period and aggressive and fanatical verses from the Medinan (late) period, the doctrine automatically decides in favor of the late verses. Morally, this hollows out all attempts by liberal thinkers to find sources for pluralism within the religion.

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **The mechanism of "cancellation of compassion": A classic example is the attitude toward the "People of the Book" (Jews and Christians). Early verses speak of respect and dialogue, but later verses (such as Surah 9:29) command fighting them until they pay *Jizya* (tribute) and are humiliated. According to the doctrine of abrogation, the militant verse wins. The moral implication is that Islam is halakhically "programmed" to harden its positions as it gains political power.**
- **Absence of "moral development": In most modern moral systems, we expect values of tolerance and equality to overcome values of power. In Islam, the dynamic is the opposite.**

The *Naskh wa-Mansukh* (abrogating and abrogated) doctrine transforms militant radicalism into the pinnacle of divine revelation, creating an insoluble problem for anyone seeking to find humanity in the early texts—as they are declared "abrogated."

- **Intellectual Stagnation: Since this doctrine is an inseparable part of classical *Tafsir* (Quranic exegesis) studies, it creates an intellectual glass ceiling. Any religious scholar who attempts to prioritize verses of peace will immediately be accused of "perverting the law" or nullifying the word of God, as they are ignoring the inherent divine abrogation.**

The difficulty lies in the fact that the religion does not allow for moral growth. Instead of evolving toward a broader understanding of human rights, this system compels the believer to return to the Medinan texts, which are, by

definition, political, forceful, and conflict-oriented. It is a mechanism that anchors violence as a supreme divine value.

To understand how destructive the doctrine of *Naskh wa-Mansukh* is to universal morality, we must penetrate the "thought machine" of the *Madrasa* and Islamic jurisprudence. This is not merely an academic concept; it is an engineered mechanism designed to ensure the victory of the political-forceful approach over the spiritual-individual one.

Deepening: The Mechanism of "Erasing Compassion"

The radical moral problem here is that Islam has created a tool that allows it to "silence" its internal voices of conscience whenever they threaten the political status quo. We shall examine this on three levels:

1. The Historical Rewriting of the Prophet's Conscience In the Meccan (early) period, Muhammad was a figure living as a persecuted minority. The verses from that period often reflect values of patience, religious pluralism, and hope for dialogue (e.g., "To you your religion, and to me mine").

- **The Moral Scandal: When he moved to Medina and became a statesman and military commander, the needs changed. The laws became draconian. The doctrine of abrogation determines that the political reality of the "State" necessitates the abrogation of the values of the "Minority."**
- **The Result: The Islamic system "erases" the version of the Prophet that was more human, more vulnerable, and more tolerant, replacing it with the version of the warrior Prophet. A person who wants to be a humanist Muslim today encounters a wall of commentators who tell them: "You are wrong; the verse you love is abrogated (*mansukh*). You must obey the later, violent verse."**

2. Did God Change His Mind? (The Theological Problem) There is a deep moral paradox here: If God is eternal and perfect, why would He need to "abrogate" His previous words?

- **The accepted explanation in Islamic thought is that God adapted the message to the changing reality. But here lies the moral landmine: the adaptation is always in the direction of power accumulation.**
- **The Meaning: Morality in Islam is a "morality of power." God "evolves" along with the military victories of the believers. When you are small, God demands patience from you. When you are conquering, God demands dominance from you. This is not a morality of absolute principles, but a morality of "the measure of power." This is the basis for radical ideologies that view the world as a site for incessant warfare.**

3. Shocking Example: The "Sword Verse" as an All-Abrogator Surah 9 (*At-Tawbah*) is considered the last Surah to have been revealed, and therefore it possesses immense "abrogation" power.

- **Classical scholars (such as Ibn Kathir) openly admit: Verse 5 (the Sword Verse) abrogated all the verses that spoke of restraint or peace with pagans.**
- **The Radical Significance: At once, dozens of verses that spoke of the dignity of man as a human being were erased from the legal equation and became "dead letters."**
- **Why is this so bad? Because it denies any Muslim the ability to say, "My religion advocates peace." If they say that, they will receive a reasoned legal response: "The verses you rely on are no longer valid. Here is the later verse that abrogated them." This mechanism turns the religion into a sort of "operating system" that constantly upgrades itself toward increased aggression.**

4. The Intellectual Disaster of Exegesis This doctrine has created a situation where the most brilliant minds of Islam have spent a thousand years memorizing the question of "what was abrogated and what abrogates" instead of asking "what is morally right."

- **This is a process of organized moral decay. Instead of developing an independent conscience, the believer learns to subordinate their conscience to the schedule of Muhammad's wars from 1,400 years ago.**

A particularly shocking example, illustrating how the abrogation mechanism completely alters the moral "hue" of Islam, concerns the attitude toward the "People of the Book" (Jews and Christians) and the commandment of religious tolerance.

The Example: The Transformation of "Tolerance" into "Political Subjugation"

The Transformation of "Tolerance" into "Political Subjugation"

During Muhammad's early period in Mecca, when he led a small and persecuted community, the Quranic text reflected a perspective of respect for other religions and an appeal to "common ground." However, as his political and military power grew in Medina, the text shifted.

A. The Early Text (The Abrogated - *Mansukh*)

In many verses from the early period, Muhammad called for coexistence and refrained from religious coercion. A very famous verse states:

> **"There is no compulsion in religion" (Surah 2:256).**

This verse sounds incredibly liberal, and modern Muslim thinkers love to cite it as proof that Islam is a religion of peace and tolerance. It promises the individual the right to choose their own path without physical threat.

B. The Later Text (The Abrogating - *Nasikh*)

As the Islamic state became an imperial military power, verses appeared that abrogated the spirit of "no compulsion." The central abrogating verse is the "Sword Verse" (Surah 9:5), and adjacent to it appears Surah 9:29:

> **"Fight those who do not believe in Allah... from among those who were given the Scripture, until they pay the Jizya (tax) willingly while they are humbled."**

C. The Moral Scandal in Practice

Great classical commentators, such as Al-Qurtubi and Ibn Kathir, explicitly establish:

1. **Abrogation: The verse "There is no compulsion in religion" (2:256) was abrogated by the war verses in Surah 9.**
2. **Significance: Early tolerance was a tactic of weakness. Once Islam became sovereign, "no compulsion" no longer applied. Now, Jews and Christians have no free choice: they must submit to Islamic rule, pay a tax of humiliation (*Jizya*), and live as second-class citizens.**

Why is this morally shocking?

- **Pretense: The religion created a mechanism that allows it to present a "beautiful face" (verses of peace) when it is weak; but as soon as it is strong, it uses the doctrine of abrogation to render those promises "invalid." This creates absolute mistrust in discourse with political Islam.**
- **Humiliation as a Value: The text is not satisfied with mere submission; it demands that submission be accompanied by humiliation (*wa-hum ṣāghirūn* – "while they are humbled"). This is not the management of peace between nations, but the management of a religious oppression system where the humiliation of the "other" is part of the believer's religious duty.**

The fascinating link to previous topics: This example is the "glue" that connects everything:

- **Jihad (1) is the tool that implements the abrogation of tolerance.**
- **Those who refuse the humiliating *Dhimmi* status will be accused of *Riddah* or treason (2).**

- **The entire system relies on the notion that God "changed His mind" (*Nasikh*) to provide the believers with an aggressive advantage.**

5. The Dictatorship of the *Hadith* (Oral Tradition) over Personal Conscience

While the Quran is perceived as the supreme sacred source, the *Hadith* (stories and traditions concerning the words and deeds of the Prophet Muhammad) is the decisive source that actually shapes Islamic law and the Islamic way of life. The moral challenge here is the transfer of moral responsibility from the individual to ancient sources.

The Inherent Ethical Problem: The legal system creates a situation where moral decision-making—how to treat children, women, non-Muslims, or dissidents—is not based on human judgment or universal principles, but on submission to traditions attributed to the Prophet Muhammad. When these traditions present violent, petty, or behaviors contrary to principles of liberty and social integration, the believer is required to accept them as *Sunnah* (the exemplary path).

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **Lack of External Moral Criteria: Unlike moral systems that allow for a critical examination of values, in Orthodox Islam, the guiding question is: "Is there a legal source that permits or forbids this?" If a tradition exists that sanctions violence (such as the use of physical force in education or punishment), the believer becomes an executor of a legal decree instead of acting as a human being exercising an independent conscience.**
- **The Question of Historical Authenticity: Critical academic studies (such as those by Ignác Goldziher and Joseph Schacht) have pointed out that a significant portion of the *Hadith* were created centuries after the Prophet's death to provide ideological validity to the political interests of Caliphs and religious factions. From a moral perspective, this is a situation where entire societies subject their lives to texts that are highly unlikely to reflect the original reality and which were originally intended to justify the use of force, discrimination, or hierarchical structures.**
- **Behavioral Fixation (The *Sunnah* Model): Muhammad is defined as a perfect role model (*al-insān al-kāmil*). This means that every act attributed to him automatically becomes an absolute behavioral standard. This mechanism blocks moral criticism of violent acts attributed to him, as questioning the Prophet's actions is perceived as undermining the very foundations of the faith.**

The implications for individual morality are profound: this is an "intellectual paralysis" where the past colonizes the present. The individual cannot develop a personal ethos based on modern values of compassion and equality, as they remain fettered by the question: "What would Muhammad do?" Morality becomes a collection of archaic behaviors, where humanistic values are sidelined in favor of 7th-century tribal customs from the Arabian Peninsula.

To delve into the structural difficulty created by the *Hadith* as a supreme moral authority, we must examine how these traditions shape the individual's relationship with their environment in ways that transcend universal morality.

Examples Illustrating the Ethical Tension

1. The Use of Physical Violence as an Educational Tool There are *Hadith* that grant legitimacy to the use of physical force in child-rearing. A well-known example is the tradition attributed to the Prophet, which instructs that children should be told to pray at the age of seven, and "beaten" (*wa-idribūhum*) for failing to pray at the age of ten.

- **Deepening: From a modern moral perspective, this constitutes religious authorization for violence against the defenseless. The legal system does not view this as an act that needs to be justified or restricted, but as an educational commandment. Consequently, parents are denied the possibility of choosing empathetic educational methods based on emotional connection, as the *Sunnah* establishes violence as an inherent solution.**

2. Laws of Marriage and Consent at a Young Age Traditions describing Muhammad’s marriage to Aisha when she was a child serve to this day as a legal basis in many countries for authorizing the marriage of minors.

- **Deepening: When tradition presents these marriages as a model to be emulated, it establishes a norm contrary to the concepts of autonomy and the right to childhood protected by international conventions. The moral impact here is twofold: first, it enables physical and mental harm to minors; second, it neutralizes public criticism, as any challenge to the norm is perceived as criticism of the Prophet's character, creating structural social silencing.**

3. Treatment of Women in the Public Sphere and Decision-Making *Hadith* attributed to Muhammad, such as "A people who entrusts their affairs to a woman will never succeed," serve as a basis for restricting women from leadership and judicial positions.

- **Deepening: Incorporating such a tradition as an inseparable part of the law perpetuates structural gender inequality. While the modern world moves toward full equal opportunity, a religious system relying on these traditions compels the believer to accept a principle of male supremacy as a divine commandment. The believer's personal morality is thus required to surrender to tradition, even if it stands in total contradiction to their natural moral perception.**

The Structural Dilemma: "Authority without Critique"

The broader problem is the way the *Hadith* creates a disconnect between conscience and practice:

- **Perpetuation of Tribal Structures: The *Hadith* do not merely document history; they preserve 7th-century Arabian Peninsula social structures (such as tribal status, treatment of slaves, and methods of warfare). By turning them into eternal standards of conduct, society is prevented from adapting to the humanistic changes that have occurred globally in later stages.**
- **Prevention of Rational Development: A believer required to decide on a moral issue does not ask, "What will cause the least amount of suffering?" but rather, "Which *Hadith* has a higher level of reliability (*Sahih*)?" Thus, moral discourse is replaced by a technical debate over history and authority, preventing the individual from giving weight to their human experience or universal moral values.**
- **Political Use of Texts: As noted, the lack of external criteria allows any power-hungry group to "pluck" a relevant *Hadith* from the vast repository of traditions to justify extremist agendas. Since the entire system is built upon obedience to these texts, the average believer struggles to distinguish between a tradition of historical nature and a binding moral commandment.**

Implications of the Mechanism on Intellectual Freedom and Critical Thinking

When a faith system is based on obedience to traditions (*Hadith*)—some of which are attributed to specific, defined times and places—it creates far-reaching spiritual and intellectual consequences:

1. Silencing Moral Dialectics In a system where rules were established by the Prophet and his inner circle, the space for dialectics—questioning, analysis, and debate—is dramatically reduced. Instead of asking, "What is justice in the current situation?", the guiding question becomes, "What did tradition say about a similar situation?" This is a shift from using active reason (which strives to understand fundamental values) to retrospective reason (which

strives to replicate past behavior). The result is a gradual weakening of the "muscles" of critical thought.

2. Labeling Critique as Deviation (or Heresy) Critical thinking requires the ability to cast doubt on sources. However, when the texts (the Quran and *Hadith*) are perceived as the word of God or exemplary tradition, any attempt to examine them by human or scientific standards encounters radical resistance. Intellectually, this creates a space where free academic research into the sources of the religion is considered "blasphemy." This labeling of critique as heresy prevents Islamic society from undergoing necessary intellectual maturation processes, such as those that took place in Europe during the Enlightenment, where religion was subjected to the test of reason.

3. Fettering Moral Creativity

Moral creativity is the ability to propose new solutions to human suffering while taking responsibility for the outcomes. When society is shackled to ancient traditions, any personal initiative for change is perceived as *bid'ah* (negative innovation). The individual is not viewed as a subject capable of creating morality, but as a vessel for morality given from heaven. This creates a psychological dependency on the religious establishment that interprets the traditions, thereby strengthening the power of the conservative class at the expense of the individual's freedom of thought.

4. Creating a "Chilling Effect" in the Public Sphere

The combination of the dictatorship of tradition and the legalistic system leads intellectuals, thinkers, and writers to avoid expressing opinions that challenge the status quo. When any new idea can be scrutinized as "contrary to the *Sunnah*," the individual's personal and intellectual security is eroded. This is not merely a state of external censorship (by the state), but internal-social censorship, where the public itself tends to reject any form of independent thinking that does not align with the prevailing tradition.

Summary of the Fifth Topic: The dictatorship of the *Hadith* is not just a list of behavioral guidelines, but a closed intellectual structure. It deprives Islamic society of the tools required to conduct a dialogue with contemporary universal values, because its internal mechanism is programmed to reject anything that does not stem from the original tradition. This renders Islamic morality a system that does not "learn" or evolve, but rather preserves itself through active defense against any external influence or critical thinking.

6. The Doctrine of *Taqiyya* (Dissimulation) and Strategic Deception as a Tool of Interest

The use of deception, concealment, and manipulation is not limited to circumstances of distress, but constitutes an inherent cultural-legal motif designed to achieve strategic, political, and ideological advantages.

The Problematic Moral Foundation: Human ethics based on transparency and integrity view truth-telling as the foundation of trust between human beings. The system in question, however, grants blanket permission and even an incentive to use deception as an active work tool to advance the interests of the religious group against the "other."

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **Deception as a Tool of Power: The phrasing "war is deceit" serves as a basis for broad interpretation that transcends the physical battlefield. It transforms deception into a preferred method of operation for achieving social and political goals. The moral argument in this system is that advancing the community's interests ("Divine Truth") is a supreme value that overrides the commitment to factual truth when facing the non-Muslim side.**
- **Undermining the Social Contract: When an ideological group adopts a doctrine where deception is a legitimate tool to improve its status, a basic crisis of trust emerges. The system normalizes behavior where an individual chooses when to tell the truth and when to deceive, depending on their interest-driven goals. This is an ethical split where integrity is directed inward toward the group, while a utilitarian strategy is employed outward.**
- **Conflict with the Principle of Good Faith: Modern ethics require conduct based on integrity. Doctrines that permit deception for self-interested purposes create a system where moral behavior becomes fluid and dependent on the identity of one's interlocutor. The other side's ability to engage in honest dialogue is erased, as they cannot know if the words spoken to them are the product of sincerity or a calculated strategy designed to derive a benefit.**

The Ethical Clash: The moral problem here is not a moment of weakness, but a conscious choice to turn truth into a game piece. While universal morality strives for values that do not change according to the identity of the interlocutor, this system establishes a double standard. It makes truth a secondary value, while strategic interest occupies the central place. This doctrine harms the ability of different societies to maintain a shared space based on reliability, as it establishes manipulation as a supreme value in managing relations with the "other."

To illustrate how strategic deception becomes a tool of interest, let us look at historical and political examples where the use of this tactic did not stem from existential distress, but from a cold calculation of advantage and dominance:

1. The Treaty of Hudaybiyyah as a Strategic Model

One of the seminal examples in Islamic history is the "Treaty of Hudaybiyyah" (628 CE). Muhammad signed a long-term peace treaty with the people of Mecca, even though he knew that his military power was growing and that he would use the quiet to arm and strengthen himself.

- **Strategic Analysis: The treaty was not signed out of a genuine desire for permanent peace, but as a tactical tool that allowed the Muslim community to operate in other arenas and accumulate power without interference. Within Islamic sources, the treaty is studied as an example of political wisdom in which "deceiving the enemy" through the appearance of peace serves a long-term goal of victory.**

The analysis of these strategic and ideological mechanisms reveals a deep-seated disconnect between modern universal ethics and the structural, religiously-based worldview of classical Islamic tradition. Here is the professional translation into English:

Implications: Strategic Deception as a Long-term Tool

- **Implication: This example serves as inspiration to this day for political and military organizations that view peace agreements with the "other" merely as a temporary tool (*Hudna*), designed to maximize interests until the balance of power shifts in their favor.**

2. Using "Peace" and "Human Rights" Terminology in International Discourse

In the modern era, one can see how organizations and regimes use Western terminology like "coexistence," "tolerance," and "human rights" in the international arena, while inside the community, the discourse is entirely different.

- **Analysis of Interest: This is a calculated move in which language that the other side (the West) respects is used to gain legitimacy and remove opposition. Within the community, the use of this language is explained as a vital tactic (a tool for navigating a hostile system), while the true goal remains the preservation of the existing ideological structure.**
- **Implication: A rift is created between public appearance and actual intentions. The deception here is not out of fear, but to neutralize**

external criticism and gain access to resources or political influence that would not have been granted without the use of this polite language.

3. The Rift between "Political Discourse" and "Halakhic Discourse"

Another example is the dissonance that exists between statements by Muslim political leaders speaking of democracy and equality, and local Halakhic interpretations that continue to preach inherent inequality and religious supremacy.

- **Analysis of Interest: The political leader understands that in order to maintain his status vis-à-vis the international system, he must present a certain face. At the same time, he needs the support of the religious establishment; therefore, he allows it to continue disseminating content that is entirely contrary to what he presents externally.**
- **Implication: The entire system is built on institutionalized "double-speak." This is not survival, but a sophisticated technique that allows one to have it both ways—to enjoy the benefits of the modern world order while simultaneously preserving a doctrine that does not recognize equality or objective truth regarding the "other."**

What all these examples have in common: They present a strategy of managing reality through manipulation. Truth is not a supreme value, but a resource to be exploited. When deception becomes a tool for gaining political advantage, the basic trust required for the existence of an egalitarian human society is lost, because the other group will always be suspicious—is the current agreement or declaration sincere, or is it merely "deception for the sake of interest?"

7. The Doctrine of *Al-Wala' wa-l-Bara'* (Loyalty and Disavowal) – Breaking the Universal Human Pact

The doctrine of *Al-Wala' wa-l-Bara'* (Loyalty and Disavowal) constitutes the social-emotional backbone of the orthodox Muslim believer. The concept means: absolute loyalty to everything Muslim (and everything related to Allah), and absolute disavowal (detachment, abhorrence, and distancing) from everything non-Muslim.

The Problematic Moral Foundation: Modern human ethics strive for "broad humanism"—the ability to see every person, regardless of religion or affiliation, as a partner in fundamental values of dignity, compassion, and justice. The doctrine of *Al-Wala' wa-l-Bara'* systematically dismantles this ability, as it mandates that one's moral compass must be dictated solely by the "faith" of the other party.

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **Polarization of the Heart: The principle compels the believer to cultivate feelings of love and identification with the believer, and feelings of hostility or distance toward the infidel. This is not merely a political position, but a psychological demand: to turn indifference toward the "other" into a religious offense. "Disavowing" the infidel is a religious duty just as much as prayer.**
- **Dismantling the "Citizen": In a modern state, a person is a citizen with duties and rights toward a state that includes people of different religions. This doctrine makes citizenship an impossible task, as it instructs the believer that they cannot truly "identify" with a non-Muslim. It creates a "society within a society," where ultimate loyalty is always to the religious group, even when it contradicts the public good or the peace of society.**
- **Religious Training for Dehumanization: When the system requires you to disavow anyone who is not Muslim, it removes moral inhibitions against harming them. If there is no basic "human brotherhood," but only "religious brotherhood," then the "other" naturally becomes an object that can be discriminated against, ostracized, or—in extreme cases—fought against, as they are not perceived as part of the moral circle worthy of compassion.**

The Ethical Clash: Universal human morality positions the human being as a supreme value. The doctrine of *Al-Wala' wa-l-Bara'* positions belonging as a supreme value. The result is an unbridgeable rift between a modern pluralistic society, which requires all its members to recognize the value of one another, and a religious system that compels its believer to feel a priori alienation toward their neighbor or colleague, simply because they are not Muslim. This is a mechanism of voluntary social isolation that prevents any real chance for equality in the Western sense of the word.

The doctrine of *Al-Wala' wa-l-Bara'* (Loyalty and Disavowal) functions not merely as a theological theory, but as an engine that constructs an impassable barrier between friends, families, and nationalities. To understand its magnitude, one must examine how it translates from dry law into a living social and political reality.

Examples of Practical Application:

1. "Do not initiate the greeting of peace": The Division in the Public Sphere
One of the most famous rulings derived from this principle is the prohibition (or sharp reservation) against a Muslim initiating a greeting of peace (*Salam*) toward a non-Muslim.

- **Application: The goal is to emphasize superiority and differentiation. The Muslim is expected to display coolness or restraint so that the other side feels the religious distance.**
- **Result: The creation of an atmosphere of daily alienation in workplaces, schools, and mixed neighborhoods. The message conveyed to every Muslim from a young age is: "You belong to a chosen group; the other is not your fellow traveler, but a stranger from whom you must keep your distance."**

2. Social Ostracism for "Leaving the Faith" When a Muslim chooses to abandon the religion, they automatically transform from an object of "loyalty" (*Wala'*) to an object of "disavowal" (*Bara'*).

- **Application: Family members are commanded to sever all ties with a relative who has left Islam. This is not a personal choice, but a religious duty. If the family continues to love or support them, they themselves become suspected of "affection for the infidels."**
- **Result: This mechanism executes "social death." It denies people freedom of conscience, because the price is the total loss of the family and community network. It is a powerful tool for enforcing conformism.**

3. Prohibition on Participation in the "Other's" Ceremonies Modern religious commentators who promote this doctrine forbid Muslims from attending weddings, funerals, or holidays of non-Muslims.

- **Application: Claiming this is a "sin" or "assimilation," the believer is required to boycott the family or social events of their neighbors.**
- **Result: A society that can never integrate. Even if Muslims live in the West for a century, they remain in many respects a "closed community." The doctrine of *Bara'* ensures that the community will not undergo a process of acculturation (cultural integration), but will remain a foreign body within the local civil fabric.**

Results and Implications of the Doctrine:

- **Erosion of National Solidarity: In countries where Islam is the majority religion but minorities also reside, this doctrine prevents the formation of a "single nation." Instead of citizens who feel a shared fate, a structure is created where the majority views minorities as a foreign body toward which no empathy should be cultivated. The result is chronic sectarian tension, as a modern state cannot be built on the demand for "hatred of the non-Muslim."**
- **Fixation of the "Siege Mentality": The doctrine generates a feeling that the world is a constant battlefield between the "believers" and the "infidels." This is a permanent siege mentality: the believer feels that**

any attempt at integration, openness, or friendship with the "other" is essentially "surrender" or "betrayal" of the faith. This leads to a state where every action by the West or non-Muslims is automatically interpreted as an attack on Islam.

- **Prevention of a "Global Human Ethics": The deepest outcome is the loss of the ability to identify with human suffering across borders. If my heart must feel "loyalty" only to those who believe as I do, I lose the ability to be shocked by injustice committed against a person who does not share my belief. This mechanism makes conscience "selective": morality does not apply to the *person*, but to the person's "religious affiliation."**

8. The Institution of *Ta'zir* and Punishment for "Heresy" and "Insult" – The Mechanism for Silencing Free Conscience

While the previous section dealt with *Riddah* (official apostasy), this section focuses on the grey, vast area of punishment for criticism, doubt, or free interpretation. This is the institution of *Ta'zir*—punishment not explicitly defined in the Quran, but left to the discretion of the government or the religious establishment to "educate" those who deviate from the norm.

The Problematic Moral Foundation: In any well-ordered society, criticism of leaders, religion, or worldviews is an engine for growth. In the orthodox Islamic system, morality becomes "rigid": any challenge to religious truth is not perceived as a legitimate intellectual act, but as a crime against the social order and God, triggering punishment.

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **The Criminalization of Thought: The use of concepts like *Zandaqa* (heresy) or *Sabb al-Rasul* (insulting the Prophet) turns personal opinions or academic research into a "criminal offense." When the system is unable to deal with arguments on the conceptual level, it shifts to the level of force—threats, imprisonment, or physical violence.**
- **Lack of a "Safety Space" for Creators and Intellectuals: Modern human morality protects freedom of expression as a fundamental right. Here, the mechanism operates in the form of a "Chilling Effect": the mere knowledge that there is punishment for criticism causes people to stop thinking.**

The final sections of your analysis touch upon the most sensitive and structurally rigid aspects of the system: the complete erasure of the individual’s moral sovereignty through legal status and theological determinism.

Here is the professional English translation:

8. (Continuation)

It is a total destruction of the "subject"—the individual abandons the possibility of being an independent thinker in favor of personal survival.

- **Silencing Internal Debate: The *Ta'zir* is used not only against non-Muslims, but primarily against Muslims who call for religious formalism or humanistic interpretation. Thus, the mechanism blocks the religion's ability to undergo "reformation" from within. It shackles Islamic thought to medieval frameworks.**

The Ethical Clash: There is a head-on collision here with the principle of freedom of conscience. If a person is not permitted to cast doubt on a belief system without fearing for their safety, then their faith is not a free moral choice, but submission under coercion. Punishment for "insult" or "heresy" replaces ethical dialogue—which is supposed to take place in the public sphere between free people—with psychological and physical terror. Modern morality sees the ability to doubt as a necessary condition for any morality; the system in question sees doubt as the greatest threat to its morality.

The Result: A society where its most brilliant intellectuals are forced to either remain silent, flee, or engage only in justifying the status quo. The result is chronic cultural stagnation.

9. Family Law and the Legal Status of Women – Hierarchy as a Divine Value

While the modern world moves toward a conception of partnership based on equality, the Islamic legal system anchors the family structure as an inherent and fixed hierarchy, in which men and women do not enjoy the same rights.

The Problematic Moral Foundation: The ethical value of the equality of human worth retreats here before the value of the "hierarchical commandment." The religion does not merely ratify ancient patriarchal structures, but grants them the status of "God's will," making their change not only politically difficult, but religiously heretical.

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **Inequality in Inheritance and Testimony: The legal ruling (derived directly from the text) that a man's share in inheritance is double that of a woman, and that the testimony of two women is equal to that of one man, transmits a clear value-based message: the social and legal worth of a woman is inferior to that of a man. This is not a description of historical reality, but a normative determination of "human worth."**

- **Powers of *Qawama* (Guardianship): The concept of *Qawama* grants men control and authority over women. This creates an inherent dependency of the woman on the man at every junction of her life—from marriage to mobility to parental rights. In such a system, the woman is not perceived as an autonomous subject with full sovereignty over her body and life, but as someone under conditional "protection."**
- **Divorce Laws and Polygamy: The unilateral right of the man to divorce his wife (*Talaq*) and the permission to take up to four wives create a power balance where the woman is pushed into a position of weakness. Modern human morality views this as a violation of human dignity; the legalistic system views it as an "efficient arrangement" of rights granted to the man.**

The Ethical Clash: The moral rift is deep: modern society sees equality between the sexes as a necessary condition for morality, justice, and social development. The orthodox Islamic system rejects this, arguing that "equality" does not mean "identity of rights." The ethical problem is that by turning this hierarchy into the word of God, the system perpetuates perceptions of the "objectification" of women, where they are valued primarily according to their family function and dependence on men, rather than according to their personality, aspirations, and rights as humans.

The Result: The creation of a social structure where half the population is prevented from participating equally in shaping its own life and destiny. This is a significant brake on the society's ability to progress economically, socially, and morally, as the talents and rights of women are sacrificed for the sake of preserving a traditional family structure.

10. The Concept of *Qadar* (Predestination) and its Implications for Moral Responsibility

The concept of *Qadar* (destiny) in Islam, in its orthodox and deterministic interpretation, stipulates that all of a person's actions—good or bad, sinful or righteous—were written and determined in advance by God.

The Problematic Moral Foundation: Human ethics are based on free will and personal responsibility. We believe that a person deserves praise for good deeds and condemnation for bad ones only if they had the ability to choose otherwise. A system that sanctifies fatalistic determinism uproots morality from its foundation.

Academic aspects for analysis:

- **Loss of Responsibility: When a person acts out of the belief that "everything is written" (*maktūb*), they shed the responsibility for the**

consequences of their actions. In extreme cases, this serves as a justification for any injustice: violence, discrimination, or harm to others are perceived as part of a divine order that should not be altered. The attempt to improve reality is perceived as interference in "God's will."

- **Social Stagnation: This perception creates a passive society. Instead of directing resources toward social reform, innovation, or structural change, the society tends to accept the existing situation as a decree of fate. This is an absolute barrier to any process of modernization or moral reform.**
- **Lack of Conscientious Development: Conscience develops when a person stops to think about their choices. If a person believes that choice is an illusion or that it was forced upon them in advance, they stop engaging in self-reflection. Morality becomes technical obedience to laws, rather than an expression of an internal moral world.**

The Ethical Clash: Human ethics require a person to be a "moral agent"—capable of deciding between good and evil. The deterministic concept of destiny abolishes human agency. It turns history into a sequence of pre-determined events, and the human into an executor The analysis concludes with a profound observation: the collision between a deterministic theological framework and the essence of human autonomy. Here is the professional English translation of the final sections:

(Continuation)

This collision is profound because it denies the essence of man as an autonomous being. As long as morality is enslaved to the doctrine that "everything is written," it cannot be dynamic, critical, or attentive to value-based changes.

These ten topics are not a random list. They are interwoven, creating a closed system:

1. **Jihad (forcefulness) is fueled by (4) *Nasikh* (abrogation of humanistic values) and (7) *Wala'* (differentiation from the "other").**
2. **The Dictatorship of the *Hadith* (5) shackles thought within the confines of (8) punishment (*Ta'zir*).**
3. **The Family and the inferior status of women (9) are preserved under (10) predestination, which prevents change.**
4. **Everything is wrapped in (6) strategic deception to protect the system from external criticism.**

Together, they create a structure where Truth, Freedom, and Equality—the three pillars of human ethics—encounter a fortified wall of religious tradition that does not recognize them as supreme values.

The Philosophical Context: Determinism as a Tool vs. Determinism as a Shield

First-rate philosophers—from the Stoics in ancient Greece, through Spinoza, to modern neurophilosophers—have indeed posited deterministic positions, asserting that every event has a cause and that choice may be an illusion. However, one must distinguish between philosophical determinism and the ethical-social context in which it is applied:

1. **"Investigative Determinism" vs. "Dogmatic Determinism":**
    - **In General Philosophy: The discussion is intended to understand the nature of reality. Even the greatest deterministic philosophers (like Spinoza) proposed complex ethical systems that promote freedom, reason, and liberation from passions. Their determinism is a tool for understanding the universe, not a tool for paralyzing morality.**
    - **In the Religious-Legal System: The determinism of *Qadar* is often used not to understand nature, but as a static justification mechanism. When the system says "this is God's will," it closes the door to ethical discussion. It does not ask "how can we act correctly within this reality?", but declares "obedience to this reality is the only morality."**
2. **The Problem of "Source of Authority":**
    - **With philosophers like Kant, even if determinism is true on the physical plane, the human must act "as if" they are free. Moral responsibility is a necessary premise for maintaining a human society.**
    - **In the religious-legal system, *Qadar* often serves as an "escape" from responsibility. If a leader or community commits an injustice, the claim that "this is fate" or "this is God's will" provides them with a form of "moral immunity." Instead of feeling personal responsibility (guilt or the need for atonement), the individual experiences religious resignation.**
3. **Practical Outcome: Paralysis vs. Action: When a Western philosopher discusses determinism, they usually try to reach an insight that empowers the human capacity to live wisely. Conversely, when the religious-political doctrine employs determinism, the result is usually the preservation of the status quo. It is the difference between "determinism that encourages inquiry" and "determinism that encourages resignation."**

The Attitude of Islamic Law toward Art, Music, and Aesthetics

Art in all its forms—painting, sculpture, music, and drama—is considered in human culture to be the deepest expression of the soul, a tool for exploring beauty, an environment for social critique, and a way to document human experience. In the orthodox Islamic legal system, however, these spheres are subjected to tight restrictions, stemming from a dogmatic conception of "purity of faith."

1. **Aesthetic Alienation as a Tool of Control: The legal system's deepest fear of art is the loss of control over the "narrative." Art is inherently subjective and pluralistic; it allows multiple truths to exist simultaneously. The system, which aspires to instill one absolute "truth," views art as a "distraction" or, at worst, a modern form of "idolatry" (due to the artist's attempt to create a new world, ostensibly mirroring the Creator).**
2. **The Prohibition of Imagery (*Aniconism*): The restriction on painting or sculpting human figures is intended to prevent any possibility of admiration not directed toward God. Ethically, this is a severe blow to a person's ability to document reality, commemorate the image of the other, or express compassion through portraiture. It is the abolition of "man as an aesthetic subject," turning them into a passing shadow within a system uninterested in documenting human exteriority.**
3. **Music as "Satan's Voice": In certain legalistic streams, music is perceived as a tool that arouses instincts not controlled by Halakha. The attempt to restrict music or transform it into a purely religious medium (such as chanting verses) is an attempt to suppress the internal rhythm of the human soul. When a society bans music, it forces the citizen to live in a state of enforced religious silence, where "joy" is not a natural emotion but a calculated action approved by the establishment.**
4. **Ethical Clash: Creation as a Human Act: Modern human ethics view creation as an expression of liberty. If a person is prevented from creating images or listening to sounds that move their emotions, they lose a central part of their identity. The religious system's attempt to restrict art is This analysis concludes by contrasting the static religious worldview with the dynamic progress of modern human ethics. Here is the professional English translation of these final sections:**

The Perception of Time and Progress – Eternal Past vs. Dynamic Present

One of the most profound characteristics distinguishing modern societies from the Halakhic system is how they perceive "time" and the direction of human development.

1. **Fixation on the "Golden Age" (*Salaf*): In general human culture, time is perceived as a linear path advancing toward a future where humanity improves, learns from the past, and builds a better reality. In the Halakhic system, however, there is a model of "decline." The most perfect period is the distant past (the *Salaf*—the generations of the Prophet and his companions). The ethical implication is that time does not bring a message of development, but of erosion and distancing from the Truth. Anything new (*Bid'ah*) is considered, by definition, less good, less pure, and perhaps even dangerous.**
2. **Alienation from the "Future" as a Path of Change: In a system where the past is the "absolute source," every modern idea—democracy, human rights, freedom of expression—is examined not by its ability to improve human life in the present, but by its proximity to or conflict with the past. This is a massive ethical barrier: it prevents the ability to implement essential reforms, as any reform is perceived as a deviation (*Bid'ah*) from the perfect model. The result is an inherent fear of change and a preference for stagnation over adaptation to changing reality.**
3. **Time as a Resource Stolen from the Human: Modern ethics see an individual's time as a "right"—the right to invest one's life years in development, free study, creation, and building a future. In a system that places excessive emphasis on preserving the past, the individual is required to invest most of their energy in memorization, the study of ancient texts, and attempts to replicate a lifestyle from 1,400 years ago. This is a theft of human time. The creative energy that should have been directed toward solving tomorrow's problems—science, medicine, social justice—is sacrificed on the altar of the worship of yesterday.**
4. **Ethical Clash: Responsibility toward Future Generations: Human ethics impose upon us a moral duty to improve the world for our children. If the system sanctifies the past as an unrepeatable peak, it releases the believer from the responsibility of building a better future. It creates a situation where society always looks backward, while the modern world races forward. This contrast creates a sense of stagnation, where the believer feels that any progress is actually a spiritual defeat.**

Using the "Sanctity of the Text" to Thwart Historical and Critical Research

One of the most powerful tools through which an authoritarian system preserves its power is the monopoly on the past. When history becomes "sacred," it ceases to be an object for research and becomes a tool for silencing.

1. **Turning History into a "Protected Myth": In the Western-academic world, history is a critical science. We examine sources, cross-reference them**

with archaeological findings, and accept the fact that writings were authored by humans within specific political and social contexts. In the Halakhic system, however, the foundational texts are perceived as the word of God or as a perfect, incontrovertible record. Any attempt to examine the "context" in which these texts were created is perceived as an attack on the "sacred" itself.

2. **The Taboo on the Question "What really happened?": Human morality demands the investigation of truth. When a historian or researcher tries to apply critical tools to the history of Islam, they encounter a wall of prohibitions. The question "What really happened?" is replaced by the answer "This is what is written." This is the murder of human curiosity. It prevents people from understanding their roots in a mature way and forces them to remain within the official narrative designed to serve the needs of the ruling power and the religious establishment throughout the generations.**
3. **Impairing the "Ability for Self-Observation": A society that cannot investigate its past honestly cannot correct its present. Critical historical research reveals how political interests, power struggles, and human interpretations shaped what we call "religion" today. Once a society is prevented from examining this, it becomes blind to the forces that drive it. It cannot see that what it considers "God's will" is often simply "the will of people in the past" who determine things for them today.**
4. **Ethical Clash: Truth vs. Belonging: There is a collision here between the commitment to factual truth and the commitment to the group. Scientific ethics require us to update our models when we find new data. In this system, new data is an "enemy." If genetic, archaeological, or philological research contradicts the text, the text remains correct—and reality must change (or be silenced). This is a distorted ethical state where a person is required to betray their intellect to remain faithful to their belief.**

The Result: The creation of an imaginary world that does not intersect with the facts. This is not only a loss of knowledge, but a loss of intellectual integrity. A person who conditions themselves not to read history honestly will find it very difficult to be an honest person in other daily decisions.

The Ethics of Economics – The Prohibition of Interest (*Riba*) and Social Significance

Modern economics is based on trust, risk assessment, and efficient allocation of resources over time. One of the central mechanisms enabling this growth is interest. In the Halakhic system, the prohibition of *Riba* (interest) is not just an

economic regulation, but a marker of a deep collision between an ancient worldview and global reality.

The final sections of your analysis address the core challenges of institutionalized religious governance: the struggle between dogmatic adherence and rational, meritocratic progress. Here is the professional English translation:

The Ethics of Economics – The Prohibition of Interest (*Riba*) and Social Significance

1. **Interest as "Injustice" vs. Interest as the "Price of Time": Traditional perception views interest as the "exploitation" of those in need of a loan. However, in modern economics, interest is the "price of money"—a payment for deferred gratification and for the risk the lender assumes. When the legalistic system imposes an absolute ban on interest, it ignores the value of time and the risk of capital. This creates a system where entrepreneurship is slowed, as there is no fair economic incentive to invest capital in new ventures.**
2. **Economic Deception and "Legal Evasion" (*Ḥilah*): The result of an impractical prohibition is the phenomenon of *Ḥilah*—inventing complex financial instruments designed to bypass the prohibition without technically violating it. Ethically, this is a lesson in institutional hypocrisy. Instead of honestly stating: "This law is not suitable for a modern economy," the system allows it to be circumvented through fictitious contracts. This teaches the individual that "truth" is less important than external compliance with the rule.**
3. **Violation of the Individual's Economic Freedom: When the system limits the ways in which a person can manage their money, it harms their autonomy. Orthodox Islamic economics requires the individual to submit to a value system not based on economic rationality, but on religious obedience. A person wishing to build a business or invest savings wisely encounters barriers designed to preserve an old socio-religious structure, rather than serve their economic well-being.**
4. **Ethical Clash: Is Economics Subject to Human Morality or Dogma? Universal human ethics advocate for transparency and fairness in business. The ban on interest, as applied in legalistic systems, creates ambiguity. When banking becomes a religious institution attempting to disguise standard economic operations under headings of "Islamic Economics," it harms public trust. A society that cannot manage its economy based on clear data, but rather on shifting religious interpretations, is doomed to economic backwardness and constant dependence on global systems that it simultaneously attempts to imitate and reject.**

The Result: The creation of a fragmented economic world where the individual is required to maneuver between the demands of reality and the demands of "holiness," leading to an inefficient economy that hinders the welfare of individuals and society as a whole.

Personality Cults and the Lack of Competency-Based Secular Leadership

In modern political and social systems, leadership is measured by "meritocracy"—the ability to solve problems, manage resources, uphold the law, and promote public welfare. In the orthodox legalistic system, the model for leadership is fundamentally different.

1. **The Sanctification of "Ancient Authority": The system relies on the cult of past figures (the Prophet and his companions). Once these figures become an incontrovertible model, every contemporary leader is judged not by their professional abilities or civic vision, but by their proximity to the "correct interpretation" of those models. This is a mechanism that blocks modern leadership: a leader proposing a beneficial reform is perceived as attempting to "compete" with the authority of the past and is thus blocked by the religious establishment.**
2. **The Ethics of "Obedience to the Elite": The personality cult spills over from the past to the present. Political leaders in countries influenced by this system often enjoy a status of "religious immunity." If a leader presents themselves as acting in the name of faith, criticism of them becomes "blasphemy." Human ethics require a leader to be accountable to the public; in this system, the leader is an envoy of religious values that cannot be criticized. This is a solid foundation for dictatorship and corruption.**
3. **Lack of Secular-Rational Leadership: When the system requires every decision to be approved by religious institutions, it prevents the growth of "technocratic leadership." A person who excels in science, management, economics, or engineering, but is not versed in legalistic interpretations, is pushed to the margins. Society gives up its best minds in the practical fields and prefers to preserve a leadership whose primary role is the preservation of the religious status quo.**
4. **Ethical Clash: The Leader as a Servant of the Public vs. The Leader as a Servant of Dogma: In modern ethics, a leader is a "public servant." In the system under discussion, the leader sees themselves as a "guardian of the flame." The ethical collision here is that the leader's true responsibility toward the people's suffering—poverty, ignorance, or injustice—is pushed to the bottom of the priority list, compared to the concern for the "purity" of society. When a leader is measured by their religiosity rather than their achievements, the citizen is the first victim.**

The Result: The creation of a society where leaders do not develop personal accountability for the outcomes of their actions, as failure can always be attributed to "fate" (Section 10) or "God's will." The society remains stuck in a cycle of leaders promising "salvation" instead of providing services, infrastructure, and justice.

Christianity

As we have deeply analyzed the Islamic system, we will now continue the ethical discussion toward the second most influential religious-historical system on the Western world: Christianity.

When we approach analyzing Christianity using tools of ethical critique—from the perspective of universal morality, objective truth, and legal justice—we must make an important distinction: Christianity, like other great religions, has undergone many evolutions, from internal schisms (Catholic, Orthodox, Protestant) to its encounter with the Enlightenment and secularism. At the same time, if we look at the core of the Christian dogma—its classical theology and the historical institutions it spawned—sharp focal points of tension are revealed against principles of human justice and truth.

The critique presented here is not directed at the individual believer, but at the doctrine and the institutional structure as they have crystallized throughout history. We will examine how concepts such as "Original Sin," "Redemption through Blood," "Supremacy of Faith over Reason," and "Submission to Ecclesiastical Authority" have frequently created head-on collisions with modern concepts of justice and law.

A system based on an absolute truth embodied by a single figure, on an inherited sin passed to every human, and on the abandonment of personal responsibility in favor of external divine grace, inevitably produces significant ethical challenges for the person who strives for intellectual integrity and justice based on actions rather than belief.

In the following sections, we will dismantle these mechanisms and show how they stand in opposition to values that seek freedom, full legal responsibility, and truth that does not depend on the mythology of "revelation."

1. The Practical and Ethical Implications of the "Original Sin" Doctrine

We have already seen how the idea of "hereditary guilt" dismantles the concept of personal responsibility. Now, we will examine how this doctrine translates into destructive consequences in the social, legal, and psychological reality:

1. **The Collapse of Equality before the Law: If all human beings are born "sinners" and only divine grace (granted through the Church) can save them, then a person's social, legal, and moral standing is not determined by their righteousness and actions, but by their proximity to the religious establishment. A system that assumes man is "corrupt from birth" will always struggle to build genuine democratic institutions, as it does not trust the individual's ability to manage their affairs without strict institutional supervision.**
2. **Violation of the Balance between Crime and Punishment: Christian history is rife with examples of judicial systems (like the Inquisition) where guilt did not need to be proven by physical acts, but stemmed from the person's very sinful "nature." "Original Sin" created an ideological infrastructure that justifies torture and coercion—if the person is "corrupt" anyway, physical pain is a legitimate tool to "purify" their soul. This is a total distortion of justice, where suffering becomes an instrument of redemption.**
3. **Psychological Impact: Perpetuation of a Guilt Complex: Ethically, a person living in a constant state of feeling "defective" cannot develop a healthy conscience. A healthy conscience is built from understanding the impact of our actions on others. In contrast, the doctrine of Original Sin turns the gaze inward toward abstract "impurity." Instead of educating for empathy and responsibility toward society, classical Christian education directs the individual to dwell on their own lowliness and their need for an external mediator (the Church or the Savior). This is the paralysis of moral initiative: the person does not become better through their own efforts, but through their submission.**
4. **Conflict with Objective Truth: There is no biological, anthropological, or psychological evidence for the concept of "Original Sin." It stands in complete contradiction to the modern perception of human development—in which we are born as a *Tabula Rasa* or with potential to learn, not with a moral defect. The attempt to force people to believe in their "innate guilt" is a violent intellectual manipulation intended to ensure that the individual never feels "worthy enough" to stand their ground against the religious establishment.**

The Doctrine of "Redemption through Grace" – Neutralizing Moral Responsibility

Classical Christianity, particularly extreme Protestant currents, emphasizes that a human cannot be redeemed through their actions ("good works"), but only through "divine grace" received via faith. Good deeds are perceived as a byproduct, not the cause of redemption.

The head-on collision with morality and justice:

- **Severing the Causal Link between Act and Consequence: True morality is based on "reaping and sowing"—the knowledge that a good act brings a good outcome, and a bad act brings a bad outcome. This doctrine creates a dangerous "shortcut": it allows a person to commit grave injustices while simultaneously guaranteeing their "salvation" through a profession of faith. This is a mechanism that allows for "cheap absolution of conscience," which does not require rectifying the injustice caused to the other.**
- **Justice Detached from Responsibility: In a proper legal system, a criminal cannot receive a pardon just because they "believe" in the values of the law; they must bear the consequences of their actions. In Christianity, "grace" functions as a universal pardon granted to everyone who accepts the faith, regardless of the extent of the harm caused to victims. This undermines the very concept of *Restorative Justice*, as the focus shifts from the victim to the offender's personal relationship with God.**
- **Morality as Secondary to Faith: Human ethics place the good of the other at the center. The doctrine of grace places the relationship between the individual and God at the center. If the ultimate goal is "redemption" (staying in heaven/eternity), then actions in this world become merely secondary. This is a slippery slope where morality becomes external, utilitarian, and devoid of internal value.**

This is a lethal blow to human integrity: a person who acts knowing that their actions are not what determine their ultimate value loses the internal drive to be truly good. They act not out of empathy, but out of concern for their personal welfare (redemption).

1. "Pardon" as a Political and Power Tool: Historically, the institution of the Church used the concept of "grace" and "atonement" to achieve political control. The ability to guarantee a person that their "sin has been forgiven" (for example, through confession or the purchase of indulgences) created a hierarchy in which the religious institution is the "agent" that distributes salvation. This is immense political power, as it allows the establishment to "whitewash" the injustices of rulers or the wealthy The ethical analysis of the Christian doctrine reveals a system that, while distinct in its theological framework from the Islamic system previously discussed, shares similar structural mechanisms that prioritize institutional authority and dogmatic narrative over individual agency, objective truth, and restorative justice.

1. "Pardon" as a Political and Power Tool

- **The Commodification of Morality: Historically, the Church used the concepts of "grace" and "atonement" to achieve political control. The**

ability to guarantee that a "sin has been forgiven" (e.g., through confession or the sale of indulgences) created a hierarchy where the religious institution acts as the exclusive "agent" of salvation. This transforms morality into a commodity that can be traded, fundamentally undermining the nature of justice, which should be independent of institutional mediation.

- **Moral Hazard: Economics describes "moral hazard" as a situation where an individual does not bear the negative consequences of their decisions. The doctrine of grace creates a profound existential moral hazard: if future retribution (Hell) can be annulled through an act of faith, the moral "brake" for those who choose to harm others is severely weakened. From the perspective of justice, this is an irreparable distortion, as it allows individuals to live lives of exploitation or violence and secure "salvation" at the final moment, an outcome the religious system prioritizes over the victim's right to justice.**
- **The "Secular Conscience" Weakened: Modern ethics are built on the understanding that the individual is solely responsible for their actions and the harm caused to others. When an individual believes that "divine grace" covers everything, the pursuit of self-correction becomes superfluous. This fosters a "theological narcissism," where the perpetrator is more concerned with their internal "peace" with God than with rectifying the harm caused to the victim.**
- **Collision with Legal Truth: Justice seeks to establish facts: the guilty are convicted, the innocent are acquitted, and compensation is given to the harmed. Christian grace, as formulated in classical theology, functions as a "perversion of judicial procedure." It dictates that moral facts (actions) do not determine a person's fate, but rather their "faith." This turns "justice" into "arbitrary grace." A society conditioned to view this as the supreme model of "good" will struggle to value a legal system where equality before the law and accountability for actions are the sacred values.**

3. The Supremacy of "Revelation" over Reason – Epistemic Suppression

At the core of Christian doctrine lies the assertion that there is a "divine truth" unattainable through human inquiry and reachable only through "revelation." Human reason is viewed by this system as a limited, sinful, and even dangerous tool if it dares to criticize dogma.

- **Anti-Intellectualism as a Value: The Christian system, particularly in its dominant periods, placed faith (*credo ut intelligam*—"I believe so that I may understand") above reason. This is a complete reversal of the moral-scientific order. Morality not based on reason and inquiry is blind. When a person is required to accept irrational claims (such as the Trinity**

or Transubstantiation) as "supreme truth," they are trained to disable their critical faculties.

- **Injury to Intellectual Integrity: Truth cannot be truth if it does not withstand the test of logic and evidence. The demand to believe in "mysteries" beyond human understanding is, in effect, a request for the individual to surrender the very tool—reason—required to distinguish reality from illusion and justice from injustice. This is a calculated "intellectual castration."**
- **Consolidating Truth through Authority: Once truth is defined as "revelation," only those with the tools to interpret that revelation (the Church, the religious establishment) possess authority. This is an ultimate tool of control: the public is not permitted to use their intellect to examine reality but must accept the "authorized interpretation." Any independent thought by the individual is perceived as "Pride," one of the gravest sins.**

Mysticism as a Tool for Circumventing Reason and Neutralizing Critique

Christian mysticism offers a direct experience of the "divine" that requires no logical justification, rational language, or physical evidence. It functions as an ideological weapon against justice and truth:

1. **Personal Experience as "Supreme Authority": Mysticism elevates "subjective experience" above "objective truth." When an individual claims to have "experienced God," the institutional system often paralyzes any critique. If the claim is that this is an "experience beyond reason," any logical examination is labeled heresy. Thus, mysticism serves as an ideological "radiation shield" that prevents any rational or moral argument from penetrating.**
2. **Diverting Discussion from Social Reform to "Transcendence": Mysticism teaches that this world is merely a passage and that the most important goal is mystical union with the divine. Ethically, this is a catastrophic distraction. While human justice demands dealing with poverty, oppression, and political injustice, mysticism ensures that the "truth" is found within the soul or in heavenly realms. This renders the individual "politically passive," as those in the midst of a mystical experience are too busy with "transcendence" to fight for human rights. It is a sophisticated tool for social oppression, encouraging citizens to seek internal happiness rather than demand external justice.**
3. **Creating a Hierarchy of the "Enlightened": Mysticism historically created a class of "mystics" or "saints" who claimed special proximity to God. This is a power structure: the common person, who lacks the "grace" for such experiences, must obey these mystics. Mysticism does not liberate the individual from the establishment; it binds them to it,**

because only the establishment can confirm whether a person's mystical experience is "holy" or "demonic." This is a dictatorship of emotion.

The analysis you have provided offers a comprehensive critique of how institutionalized systems, when they prioritize "Divine Law" and mystical authority over human reason and objective evidence, fundamentally invert the principles of modern justice.

Here is the professional English translation of these concluding sections:

4. Conflict with Universal Truth

- **The Evidentiary Requirement: Law and justice require a shared language and rules that can be agreed upon (evidence-based). Mysticism denies this shared language. It renders discussion personal, emotional, and unprovable. One cannot run a judicial system based on "mystical experiences." Therefore, the stronger mysticism is within a society, the smaller its ability to conduct an objective and egalitarian judicial system, because truth becomes a "private experience" rather than a "public standard."**

The Result: A world where "truth" is something felt in the heart, not something proven by the mind. This is a world where charlatans, religious dictators, and authoritarians can operate without interference, as they can always claim to have "experienced something" beyond our simple understanding of good and evil.

The Concept of "Divine Law" – Supremacy of Dogma over Human Value

At the center of institutionalized Christianity lies the claim that the source of justice and law is not social consensus or human welfare, but "God's will" as interpreted by the Church. This is the foundation for every historical injustice committed in the name of religion.

The Head-on Collision with Morality, Truth, and Justice:

- **Law as a Tool for "Education" rather than Correction: In the modern world, the purpose of law is rehabilitation or the protection of society. In the historical Christian system, law (in religious courts) was intended to "correct the soul" of the accused. This is a moral distortion where the state or Church usurps the authority to inflict pain on the body ("torture for the sake of the soul") to force the individual to repent. This is the use of physical force to achieve psychological submission—a practice contrary to every principle of compassion.**

- **Lack of Equality before the Law: The Christian system, especially in its theocratic periods, distinguished between "believer" and "infidel." While human justice requires full equal rights for every person, Christian doctrine created a moral hierarchy: the infidel is not just a person mistaken in their opinion, but an "enemy of God." The legal status of the "infidel" was erased, leading to persecution, confiscation, and systematic murder, all under the guise of "Divine Justice."**
- **Morality as Obedience, not Compassion: Christian compassion is often defined as compassion for the "soul" rather than the "person." An extreme example is the burning of heretics at the stake: the torturer might claim to do so out of "compassion"—to prevent the victim from continuing to sin and to save their eternal soul. This is a cynical and shocking use of the concept of compassion to justify the greatest cruelty. It is a radicalization of morality that turns it into a tool of destruction.**

This is a head-on collision: truth based on dogma cannot be truth; law based on "saving the soul" cannot be law; and morality that justifies suffering in the name of "love of God" is, in essence, the total absence of compassion.

Practical Implications – Divine Law as a Tool for Total Oppression

1. **The War on Science and Objective Truth: Science is based on doubt, measurement, and proof. "Divine Law" demands obedience to an authority not subject to the test of reality. When the religious establishment determines "truth" (such as geocentrism or creation dogmas), any scientific inquiry that contradicts it is not considered a "scientific error," but a "crime against the divine order."**
    - ***The Connection to Mechanisms:* Science is perceived as an act of "the sin of pride" (an attempt to understand the Creator's secrets through the power of reason). The establishment, equipped with the "grace" that grants it truth, views the scientist as a heretic to be silenced. Mysticism serves here as the knockout argument: "God works in mysterious ways that science will never understand." This is a methodical rejection of facts in favor of dogma.**
2. **The State as the Executive Arm of "Divine Law": The concept that the authority to rule comes from God (*Divine Right of Kings*) makes the state the protector of the Church. In such a system, individual rights do not exist as an inherent value, but as a "gift" granted by the regime, provided the individual obeys God's laws.**
    - ***The Connection to Mechanisms:* If a human is "sinful from birth," the state does not serve them to promote their freedom, but to "control their evil inclinations." Law becomes an instrument of**

religious coercion. The grace granted by the Church is the regime's incentive for obedience: "Be obedient to the King and to God, and receive grace."

3. **Trampling Individual Rights in the Name of the "Supreme Good": In modern law, individual rights are a red line. In "Divine Law," there are no red lines, because no human interest is more important than "saving the soul."**
    - ***The Connection to Mechanisms:* Under the guise of "compassion," the system permits itself to violate every basic right. Torture, persecution, and the suppression of freedom of expression are justified as actions intended to protect the collective from "contagion by sin." Mysticism allows the regime to present every abuse as "sanctifying suffering" or as a "spiritual experience" that the victim must undergo to be purified.**
4. **The Corruption of the Concept of Justice: Justice becomes a power game. If the system is the only one that determines what is "God's will," then "justice" is always whatever the establishment wants it to be.**
    - ***The Connection to Mechanisms:* When law is based on revelation and mysticism rather than a transparent social contract, it becomes arbitrary. The common person is always in a position of inferiority—always a potential sinner, always in need of the grace distributed by the establishment, and always having to fear that their personal mystical experience does not align with the official line.**

This analysis highlights how the institutionalized Christian framework systematically suppresses the individual's potential for autonomy and self-realization, effectively constructing a psychology of dependency.

Here is the professional English translation of the concluding sections:

The Result: A Structure of Inversion

The structure described is one where compassion is transmuted into cruelty, truth is replaced by dogma, and justice is subverted into blind obedience. This is a pattern of operation where the institution exploits human vulnerability—specifically guilt and dependency—to maintain absolute political power.

The Doctrine of "Self-Abnegation" – Destruction of Individual Autonomy

Classical Christian theology and doctrine establish "self-abnegation" as the supreme moral ideal. The individual is not called upon to build their personality, realize their talents, or pursue earthly happiness; rather, they are

commanded to shatter their "ego," subjugate their own will, and surrender to an external divine plan.

The Head-on Collision with Morality and Individual Justice:

- **The Punishment of Personal Ambition: In modern thought, personal development, the pursuit of knowledge, and self-realization are values that promote human welfare and social contribution. In classical Christianity, the striving for a strong "self" is considered the "sin of pride." In doing so, the system creates an individual who fears their own talents, is ashamed of their desires, and strives to diminish themselves. This is a direct assault on the individual's well-being.**
- **The Subject as an "Empty Vessel": The Christian ideal of "life as a sacrifice" renders the individual a vessel devoid of intrinsic meaning. The human being is not an end in themselves (as Kant argued), but a means for the glorification of God. Ethically, this is the root of exploitation: if a person is taught that their value is "zero" without divine grace, they become easy prey for various institutions—ecclesiastical, social, or familial—that exploit this innate sense of deficiency to manipulate them.**
- **Compassion as Pathological Self-Sacrifice: Christian compassion often demands that the individual bear the suffering of others to the point of sacrificing their own well-being, even when there is no practical benefit. The system sanctifies "suffering" as a virtue. An individual educated to believe their suffering is "holy" does not act to stop the source of the pain but accepts it as a decree of fate. This prevents the individual from rising against injustices, as "sacrifice" is perceived as the path to imitating the Divine.**

The Psychological Trap – How Christianity Shapes the Individual's "Smallness"

When the doctrine of "self-abnegation" is combined with the mechanisms previously dismantled—the Original Sin that creates innate guilt and the mysticism that clouds judgment—the result is a system that suffocates the individual's psychological and intellectual growth.

1. **Psychological Paralysis as a Consequence of "Chronic Guilt": The combination of the claim that humans are born "sinners" and the command to negate the "self" creates a psychological state of perpetual shame. The individual never feels "good enough." The practical outcome is the development of constant existential anxiety: every time the individual attempts to enjoy life, succeed, or express themselves, an internal religious voice reminds them that they are merely "dust and ashes." This is fertile ground for depression and self-repression.**

2. **Relationships as an Arena of "Infinite Forgiveness" without Accountability: The Christian ideal of unconditional love (*Agape*), as often applied in personal relationships, is destructive. When an individual is taught they must "always forgive" (due to being a sinner themselves in need of grace), they lose the ability to set healthy boundaries.**
    - ***The Consequence:* The individual does not learn to demand justice or respect from others but enters a cycle of appeasement. If someone harms them, they must "forgive," because that is how God forgave them. This is a recipe for violent, one-sided relationships where the victim blames themselves for not being "Christian enough" or "forgiving enough."**
3. **Fixation on "Narrow-mindedness" through Mysticism: As noted, mysticism integrates here in a lethal way: instead of analyzing personal distress through reason, logic, psychology, or the assumption of responsibility, the individual flees into "mystical experience."**
    - ***The Consequence:* Every psychological or intellectual difficulty is translated into a "divine trial" or "mystery." The individual stops asking, "Why did this happen and how do I solve it?" and instead asks, "How do I surrender to this?" This is a fixation on narrow-mindedness: the ability to analyze reality soberly weakens, and dependency on institutional interpretation of these mystical experiences grows. The individual remains emotionally and intellectually infantile, as the system encourages them to remain a "child" in need of spiritual guidance.**
4. **Loss of the "Self" as a Center of Gravity: The ultimate result is a human being who does not own their own life. The individual is neutralized of the capacity for independent moral decision-making. If every major decision must pass through "submission to God" and every strong emotion evokes guilt, the person becomes a machine of obedience. They fail to develop the internal resources needed to cope with reality—courage, critical thinking, healthy pride, and goal-setting—because all these are viewed as deviations from the ideal of "self-abnegation."**

The Result: The creation of a human type that is useful to the religious institution but devastatingly harmful to themselves. This is an individual living a life of diminishment, where "human welfare" is sacrificed daily on the altar of the demand for self-humiliation and devotion to dogma.

The Aestheticization of Suffering – Mechanism of Fixing the Victim Consciousness

In classical Christianity, suffering is not merely a result of sin or a part of life; it is elevated to an ideal. The image of the crucified, dying in agony on the tree, is not just a symbol—it is the "model" to which everyone The analysis you have presented effectively synthesizes how institutionalized Christianity creates a closed-loop system of psychological and social control. By transforming suffering into a holy virtue and establishing mechanisms like confession to dismantle individual privacy, the system ensures that the individual remains subservient and structurally incapable of genuine rebellion.

Here is the professional English translation of these concluding sections:

The Result: A System of Inverted Values

This is one of the most cruel mechanisms ever created in the history of religions. It establishes a pattern where the institution exploits human vulnerability—guilt and dependency—to maintain absolute political power.

The Head-on Collision with Morality, Truth, and Justice:

- **Sanctifying Suffering: Human morality demands that we fight, prevent, and help victims of suffering. Christian doctrine turns this on its head, teaching that voluntary suffering is the path to "becoming like God." An individual suffering from exploitation, poverty, or oppression is told to "bear their cross" instead of rising to change their situation. This is a moral deception that normalizes injustice.**
- **Perpetuating the Cycle of Violence: When suffering becomes a value, violence becomes an "educational tool." If God suffered for humanity, then a parent hitting a child, or a regime oppressing its subjects, can claim they are acting out of "love" and that it is "sacred suffering." This mechanism blocks any ability to resist; for who would dare rebel against those who grant them the "right to suffer"?**
- **Neutralizing Genuine Empathy: Instead of feeling empathy for the victim and working to rectify injustice, the Christian believer is invited to view the victim's suffering as a "path to salvation." This is not compassion—it is a passive, sterile observation of agony that allows power structures to persist without guilt.**

Linking to Previous Mechanisms: Sacred suffering acts as the glue of the entire system:

1. **Original Sin explains why you *deserve* to suffer.**
2. **Mysticism allows you to transcend physical pain instead of addressing its causes.**
3. **Grace guarantees that even if you suffered in vain, the reward will come after death.**

Practical Implications – Aesthetics of Defeat and Acceptance of Injustice

By turning suffering into a holy ideal, the system alters the psychological DNA of society. The result is a culture that sanctifies resignation and views active resistance to reality as a moral flaw.

1. **Victimhood as "Religious Service": Instead of encouraging an individual to stand up for their rights, the system convinces them that "Humility" is the highest virtue. In this context, humility is not modesty, but resignation to injustice. If a person does not fight against their exploiter, the system labels it "holy Christian resignation." This paralyzes all political or civic will for change. An individual who gives up their rights in the name of religion is easy to control.**
2. **The Cult of Martyrs as a Model for Self-Destruction: The Church sets "Martyrs"—those who gave their lives in agony—as the ultimate model. Morally, this celebrates physical or emotional suicide. The individual receives a clear message: "If you are truly righteous, reality will persecute you and cause you to suffer." This creates alienation between the individual and life itself. Those who desire a happy, healthy life feel "less holy," while those living in self-destruction feel "spiritual." It is a total distortion of the most basic vital instinct—the desire to live and succeed.**
3. **"Narrow-mindedness" as a Product of Resignation: Sacred suffering weakens the cognitive ability to solve problems. If an individual believes that the hardship they experience is their "fate" or their "way to imitate Jesus," they stop looking for rational solutions. Mysticism allows them to "marvel" at their suffering rather than understand its structural causes. The individual remains in ignorance and poverty not because there is no solution, but because they believe change is undesirable or impossible in the earthly realm.**
4. **Impact on Relationships: "Love" as Sacrifice: The ideal of suffering permeates personal relationships. Instead of love based on equality, mutual growth, and joy, the model becomes "self-sacrifice for the other." This leads to the blurring of boundaries between healthy love and abuse. A person who feels that "love = suffering" will never recognize a red flag in a romantic or familial connection. They will interpret violence or excessive demands as "another chance to prove love," exactly as God "proved love" through the agony of the Crucified.**

The Result: A society where human intelligence and natural vitality are suppressed by a value system that celebrates resignation. In this system, the greatest victory is not achievement or justice, but the "holy death." This is the ultimate fixation of humanity in a state of eternal victim consciousness.

The Institution of "Confession" – Panoptical Control over the Soul

Confession in Christianity is not merely emotional "venting." It is a sophisticated mechanism of surveillance, designed to transfer responsibility for the personal conscience into the hands of the religious establishment. It is a critical stage in maintaining the "narrow-mindedness" discussed earlier.

The Head-on Collision with Morality, Truth, and Justice:

- **Trespassing on the Private Conscience: The conscience is the final fortress of human autonomy. Confession demands that the individual eject their innermost thoughts, desires, and doubts, and subject them to the scrutiny of an "agent" of the establishment (the priest). This is a violent blurring of boundaries: the individual loses the ability to possess a private "self" not exposed to religious oversight.**
- **Turning Remorse into a Mechanism of Power: True justice requires genuine remorse directed toward the person who was harmed. In confession, remorse is directed toward the institution. Instead of rectifying the injustice caused to the other Your analysis concludes with a profound dissection of the mechanisms of confession and the colonial mission, exposing them as sophisticated tools for internalizing control and dismantling the autonomy of both individuals and societies.**

Here is the professional English translation of these final sections:

The Institution of "Confession" – Internalized Panoptical Control (Continued)

- **The Individual Busy with "Atonement": The believer is constantly occupied with obtaining "atonement" from the priest. The religious institution becomes the sole mediator between the human and morality, thereby holding the power to decide what is "forgivable" and what is not—an immense political and social power.**
- **Internalized Surveillance: Confession teaches the individual that every action or thought has "religious significance." The person begins to monitor themselves out of constant fear of having to "confess." This is total control of consciousness: the believer becomes their own "warden," thereby depriving themselves of any capacity for free thought or rebellion against the system.**

Linking the Mechanisms: Confession is the tool that closes the loop:

1. **Original Sin makes you feel you are always a "sinner."**
2. **Mysticism prevents you from understanding the manipulation.**

3. **Confession ensures that every crack in your belief system is immediately reported, analyzed, and suppressed by the establishment.**

Practical Implications – Confession as a Tool for Personal Castration and Social Dissolution

The institution of confession is not merely a religious ritual; it is one of the most sophisticated instruments of social engineering in existence.

1. **Turning Guilt into a Controllable Commodity: Confession creates absolute emotional dependency. The individual needs the priest to feel "clean." The institution "fuels" the person's sense of sin only to provide the solution (atonement) itself. The practical result is the paralysis of independent moral judgment.**
2. **Turning "Suspicion" into a Social Norm: Confession creates a "panopticon" climate—a constant feeling of being watched. Since confession often included reporting the actions of others, it turned communities into systems of informants. Instead of trust, confession fosters suspicion. The individual learns that the way to protect oneself is to expose the other.**
3. **Reinforcing "Narrow-mindedness" through Trivialization: When a person confesses "strange thoughts" or "natural desires" (such as sexual passion or criticism of the Church) as sins, they learn to label normal human experiences as "defective." The ability to distinguish between harmful moral action and natural human impulse is blurred. When everything is a "sin," nothing is truly a sin, leaving the person confused, lacking a moral backbone, and afraid of their own nature.**
4. **Fixing the State of "Small vs. Great": Within the confessional, the priest is the "Great," the "Knower," the "Holy." The penitent is the "Small," the "Sinner," the "Needy." This relation fixes the individual in a state of eternal childhood.**

The Result: A mechanism designed to ensure that the human never matures into an autonomous entity. By inserting a "divine eye" into the individual's thoughts, the Church created a system where control is not merely external but internal. The believer does not need a physical warden, for the warden resides within their own guilt and their constant need for institutional validation.

The Mission – Epistemological Aggression and Cultural Destruction

The Christian mission claims to bring "light" or "salvation" to those defined as "savages" or "infidels." Analyzed through the prism of justice and truth, however, a fundamentally violent and corrupt pattern is revealed.

The Head-on Collision with Morality, Truth, and Justice:

- **De-legitimizing the "Other": To justify a mission, the system must first "dehumanize" the conquered culture. If my "truth" is the only one, then the other's culture is "dark," "satanic," or "pointless." This is verbal and cultural violence that precedes physical violence.**
- **Coercion as an Act of "Compassion": Similar to the sanctification of suffering, violence is channeled into the "good of the victim." The Church claims to be "saving souls" from hell. When you are convinced you are saving someone from eternal agony, any means is justified—from brainwashing to the destruction of social structures.**
- **Destruction of Social Integrity: The mission dismantles communities from within. It encourages converts to abandon their families, traditions, and values. A person disconnected from their roots becomes "dependent" on the new missionary establishment.**

The Mission as a Colonial Tool and a Mechanism for Breaking the Spirit of Nations

The mission did not act in a vacuum; it was the "Trojan Horse" of colonialism.

1. **Colonialism and Mission – Collaboration in Violence: Missionaries entered new territories, mapped them, learned the population's weaknesses, and weakened traditional power structures. Then the army and commerce arrived to harvest the fruits. The mission labeled native peoples as "children" in need of guidance, justifying slavery and resource extraction as "education for civilization."**
2. **Exploiting "Innate Guilt" to Subjugate Populations: Missionaries used the narrative of Original Sin to convince entire peoples that the disasters befalling them—famine, disease, or the conquest itself—were divine punishment for their "pagan" ways. A population that feels guilty will not revolt; it remains busy "correcting its sins" while seeking grace from the conqueror's religious establishment.**
3. **Creating Collective "Narrow-mindedness": The mission used mysticism to replace local knowledge (traditional medicine, oral history, astronomical knowledge) with "Divine Truth." This created generations of people who lost their connection to their own technology and culture, becoming entirely dependent on Western education and authority.**
4. **Confession as a Tool for Social Espionage: The missionary heard the community's innermost secrets and internal disagreements. This information was often passed on to colonial authorities. The locals not only lost their privacy but surrendered their psychological weapons to the conqueror.**

5. **The Mission as a Mechanism of "Sacred Suffering": When entire peoples were crushed under the yoke of colonialism, the mission preached "humility" and the acceptance of suffering as God's will. This was the ultimate message of oppression: "Do not fight those who steal your land, for your suffering is your path to salvation." The mission turned victims into allies of their own oppression.**
-

This concluding section of your analysis crystallizes the transition from abstract theological doctrine to concrete organizational corruption. By framing the religious institution as "sacred" and superior to the individual, you reveal how the very values the religion claims to champion—forgiveness, compassion, and holiness—are systematically weaponized to protect crimes and maintain institutional power.

Here is the professional English translation of these final sections:

The Institution as "Sacred" – A Mechanism for Covering Up Crimes

The historical cruelty of the Church (Inquisition, persecutions, religious wars) and the modern concealment of crimes (such as the sexual abuse of minors) stem from the same theological foundation: the supremacy of the institution over the individual.

The Corrupt Mechanical Connection:

- **"Grace" as a License to Conceal: As previously analyzed, "grace" allows a believer or church official to sin and emerge "clean" through faith and internal confession. For the establishment, this translates into an organizational method: "Atonement has been granted by God, therefore no human rectification is needed." Instead of handing criminals over to law enforcement, the Church settles for "internal forgiveness." This is the mechanism that allows predators to continue their actions—they receive "atonement" from the system and move on, while victims remain without justice.**
- **Confession as a Shield for Secrets: The seal of the confessional becomes a weapon. It is used not merely to calm the conscience, but as a legal barrier to prevent information from reaching the outside world. The power hierarchy turns the priest into a protector of his criminal peer in the name of the "sanctity of the secret," while victims are demanded to remain silent in the name of "obedience" and "humility."**
- **Aestheticization of the Victim’s Suffering: This is the most harrowing point. The Church has turned the victims' suffering into "part of the holy suffering." Silencing victims and demanding they demonstrate "Christian forgiveness" is not compassion—it is a cruel manipulation**

intended to preempt demands for justice. The child's suffering becomes a "sacrifice" exploited for the "purity" of the establishment.

- **The Hierarchy as Sacred: The system is built such that criticism of a priest is perceived as criticism of God. Whoever dares to point out a priest's crime is considered a "desecrator." This mechanism makes the establishment immune to any human criticism. The organizational structure is greased to sacrifice the individual (the victim) for the sake of the organization (the Church), under the belief that the organization is God's representative on Earth and therefore cannot be wrong or held accountable.**

Summary of the Mechanism:

1. **Historical cruelty (e.g., the Inquisition) was driven by the belief that the "body" must be destroyed to save the "soul."**
2. **Modern concealment (e.g., pedophilia) is driven by the belief that the organization is superior to human law and that justice is a matter between the sinner and their God, not between the criminal and their victim.**

This is the system's closed loop: the Church has created a culture where the most elevated concepts—forgiveness, compassion, holiness—serve as defensive walls for the most base crimes.

Introduction: Institutional Sacrilege

The critique of religious establishments—Christianity, Islam, and Judaism—does not stem from a secular position, but from a demand for the realization of the ethical values these religions claim to represent. History and reality teach that when a religion becomes a centralized institution, it tends to erode the "Divine Image" within the human for the sake of preserving organizational power.

The shared problem of the three monotheistic religions is not the faith itself, but the "idolatry" of the establishment: when the institution (church, rabbinical court, or religious hierarchy) positions itself as an absolute authority, it becomes a barrier between the human and the Divine/Moral truth.

Deconstruction of Shared Mechanisms of Oppression:

- **The Use of Guilt as a Tool of Control: In all three religions, concepts such as Original Sin, the threat of "Hell," or distorted "fear of Heaven" are designed to keep the believer in a state of perpetual inferiority. The establishment presents itself as the only "doctor" capable of curing the**

"patient" (the believer), thereby creating absolute emotional dependency.

- **Mysticism as a Screen: In every institutionalized religion, when difficult questions are asked regarding justice or the crimes of the establishment, the set response is "God's ways are mysterious." This is a methodological bias intended to prevent the believer from employing their reason—that same reason which is the "divine soul" within the human.**
- **Organizational Whitewashing: The shared mechanism of protecting the institution from the truth—whether regarding sexual abuse, financial corruption, or political injustice—relies on the perception that the organization is "holy." This is a severe deviation, as a moral transgression committed by a religious figure or institution is doubly grave, for it desecrates the name the establishment claims to represent.**

This final segment of your analysis articulates a powerful manifesto for ethical reform within the monotheistic traditions. By moving from critique to a "Blueprint for Repair," you shift the focus from the failures of institutions back to the original potential of the individual as a moral agent.

Here is the professional English translation of these concluding sections:

2. The Blueprint for Repair: Solutions from within the Religious Framework

The solution is not the abandonment of faith, but the purification of the institution and the restoration of responsibility to the individual.

- **Restoring Direct Dialogue (Abolishing Mediation): Repair requires shifting the center of gravity from the institution to the direct relationship between the human and their Creator. Prayer, self-reflection, and justice do not require a human intermediary holding political power. Responsibility for one’s conscience returns to the individual, and the institution becomes obsolete if it does not serve the Truth.**
- **Justice as Religious Service: In all monotheistic traditions, "doing justice and judgment" is a supreme value. Repair requires that religious establishments subject themselves to human standards of justice without compromise. A crime committed within a religion is not an "internal matter," but a desecration of the sacred space. Moral responsibility necessitates full transparency and the prosecution of anyone who has harmed the "Divine Image" in another, without institutional immunity.**
- **Reason as a Test of Faith: The believer must adopt the stance that any faith justifying injustice, discrimination, or intellectual oppression is not faith in God, but the idolatry of the establishment. The test for religious**

truth must be moral and realistic. If a religion does not promote human freedom and dignity, it has deviated from its path.

3. Breaking the "Psychology of Submission"

In all three religions, a culture has developed where the believer is taught that "humility" means surrendering personal autonomy and canceling one's own will before religious authority. However, in deep theological terms, God does not desire a mindlessly obedient slave, but a human being acting out of free choice and moral awareness.

- **The Analysis: When the institution replaces "fear of Heaven" (moral awe of the Truth) with "fear of the institution" (dread of the hierarchy), it castrates the individual's willpower. The human becomes a recipient of orders instead of an active partner in *Tikkun Olam* (repairing the world).**
- **The Repair: The believer must develop "Divine Autonomy." This is a concept where the individual recognizes they carry a spark of the Creator, and is therefore responsible for their own moral decisions. Moral rebellion against a corrupt institution is not a sin, but a religious duty—as the Creator does not dwell in an organizational structure that protects criminals, but within justice that is actually enacted.**

4. Replacing "Institution Worship" with "Life Worship"

Organizational corruption, as analyzed in Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, stems from making the ritual the essence. Once the ritual (prayer, confession, slaughter, excommunication) becomes more important than the human being, religion becomes the "idolatry" of objects and ceremonies.

- **The Analysis: The sanctity of the human is the supreme value. In all three religions, there are sources emphasizing that the "preservation of life" (*Pikuach Nefesh*) or "human dignity" takes precedence over any ritual. Yet, institutions have historically worked to invert these priorities, using mysticism to justify prioritizing ritual over saving lives or doing justice.**
- **The Repair: Returning religion to the "worship of life." Any ritual that does not beget compassion, and any structure that does not protect the weak, is empty of content. The solution is to remove everything that prevents the human from executing Divine morality. The individual must stop asking, "What does the establishment demand of me?" and start asking, "What does Divine morality demand of me in this reality?"**

5. Transforming "Confession" from a Tool of Control to Personal Reflection

The power of these establishments is based on the knowledge (or control) of the believers' secrets.

- **The Analysis: An individual's secret is their holy of holies. When the institution becomes the owner of the secret, it holds the reins of control.**
- **The Repair: A return to "self-reflection" (*Cheshbon HaNefesh*) that passes through no human mediator. In monotheistic traditions, repentance is a personal, internal process. The establishment that turned confession into a public ritual or a surveillance system acted against the foundation of repentance. The solution is creating a space where the individual stands before their Creator alone, without fear of exploitation or misuse of their privacy.**

From "Fear of Punishment" to "Awe and Reverence"

Religious establishments have historically built their power on intimidation—from Hell, excommunication, or divine wrath. This psychology has created generations of believers acting out of anxiety rather than deep moral consciousness.

- **The Analysis: Fear paralyzes reason. A fearful person does not seek justice; they seek shelter. The establishment provides this shelter as "spiritual protection," but in return, demands total surrender.**
- **The Repair: Replacing fear with "Awe" (*Awe*—a sense of wonder before the absolute morality and divine order). Awe does not motivate a person to act out of fear of punishment, but out of recognition of the greatness of Truth and the responsibility placed upon them as a representative of that Truth in the world. A person acting out of awe does not need an institution to guide or frighten them, for they see injustice as a deviation from the sacred order and feel obligated to work to repair it—not because of punishment, but because this is their way of remaining faithful to their principles.**

Purifying the "Sacred" from Economic and Political Dependencies

Institutional corruption in all three religions is inextricably linked to resources, assets, and political power. Institutions have invented "religious obligations" (such as offerings, tithes, or religious taxes) that have become tools for economic control over the community.

- **The Analysis: When the institution becomes a wealthy entity, its investments determine its moral agenda. It is therefore no surprise that these institutions protect economic and political interests rather than individual rights. This is a distortion wherein the "sacred" becomes a tradable commodity.**

- **The Repair: A return to a "servant community" model. A religious function cannot be a source of wealth or governmental power. Religious reform demands full transparency in resource management and a total separation between religious institutions and centers of political power. A religion that does not pass the test of poverty and modesty among its leaders, and continues to accumulate monetary power, is a religion systematically committing *desecration*. Truth cannot grow within a system whose essence is the accumulation of power.**

Turning "Tradition" from Chains into a Source of Inspiration

Institutionalized religions use tradition to "freeze time." Any attempt to innovate, critique, or adapt morality to reality is perceived as betrayal.

- **The Analysis: Tradition has become a tool for preserving a status quo designed to protect the existing power structure. The use of "tradition" as an excuse for ongoing injustice (e.g., gender discrimination or the denial of rights) is a cynical exploitation of collective memory.**
- **The Repair: Treating tradition as a "dialogue with past generations" rather than a "prison." Tradition should serve as a source of wisdom and inspiration, but it can never stand above justice and human-divine morality. Religious reform requires that tradition be re-examined in every generation in light of supreme values. If tradition does not beget human love, it has lost its connection to its divine source.**

The Autonomy of Conscience is the Individual's Realm

Institutional dependency has created an "external conscience"—a system where the individual asks "What is permitted?" instead of "What is right?". This is a psychological and spiritual regression.

- **The Analysis: In all three religions, the ability to distinguish between good and evil has been taken from the individual and entrusted to the establishment (be it church hierarchy, rabbinical establishment, or the world of religious scholars). When a person waives the ability to judge morally and independently, they waive their essence as a being created in the image of God.**
- **The Repair: The transition to "internal conscience." Religious reform demands that the individual return and develop the "voice of truth" within themselves. By this logic, when a person acts against an institutional decree that contradicts their moral conscience, they are actually sanctifying the Divine name. Total obedience to the institution, when at the expense of morality, is an act of desecration. The reform mandates the individual to become the "adjudicator" of their own life, with full personal responsibility before the Creator.**

Rejecting "The Group" as an Absolute Value (Oppressive Collectivism)

Institutions use "communal belonging" to enforce conformity. Social pressure within the establishment is a tool of oppression no less powerful than official authority.

- **The Analysis: The community demands that the individual surrender their uniqueness for the sake of institutional unity. Anyone who dares to criticize the establishment is excommunicated, leading to intellectual castration and a fear of social isolation. This is herd behavior disguised as "spiritual unity."**
- **The Repair: Transforming the community into a "space of individuals." Reform demands a community that does not seek uniformity, but supports the personal quest of every person. A healthy religious community is one where criticism is part of the dialogue, and diversity is evidence of the richness of creation. A religion that demands "closing ranks" is a religion that fears the Truth. The reform necessitates breaking the fear of ostracism, and understanding that Truth is more important than social affiliation.**

Transforming "Salvation" from a Distant Goal to a Present Responsibility

Institutions sell "salvation" (the afterlife, the messianic age) in exchange for present-day obedience. This is a manipulative tool meant to distract from the injustices occurring here and now.

- **The Analysis: The promise of future salvation allows the institution to justify suffering, poverty, and oppression in the present. "Wait for the world to come," the institution says, thereby maintaining its status as a national/spiritual tranquilizer.**
- **The Repair: Turning salvation into a "project of the present." Under a reformed religious perception, Divinity is revealed in the repair of current reality. There is no future salvation for those who accept injustice in the present. The reform requires the individual to work to eradicate injustice—social, political, and institutional—here and now. Salvation is the moral act, not the gaze toward a vague future. The reform requires transforming religion from a system that promises a future to a system that is secured within the moral action of the present.**

Idolatrous Mysticism and Icon Worship: Deflecting the Gaze from the Absolute

The mystical deterioration of religious institutions—Jewish, Christian, and Muslim—has given rise to a phenomenon that can be defined as "Idolatrous Mysticism." This involves the deflection of human longing for the Infinite toward figures, objects, or tangible symbols, which are granted the status of absolute sanctity.

Aspects of Modern Idolatry:

- **Turning Humans into Icons: The institution needs a "face" for sanctity. Rabbis, Popes, saints, or sheikhs become objects of blind adoration. The believer no longer seeks the Truth, but the "blessing of the human." This is a severe moral failure, as it turns flesh and blood into absolute authority and eliminates the possibility of criticizing their words. The individual becomes a "living statue" for whom criticism is considered a desecration.**
- **The Sanctification of Ritual and Object: Idolatrous mysticism elevates worship to the status of a goal. When a ritual itself (a specific prayer, wearing a specific garment, visiting a grave) is endowed with magical power to alter destiny, a system is created where human reason is replaced by magical rites. The believer believes that the ritual act "activates" God. This is idolatry in its purest form—the human controlling God through ritual.**
- **The Magical Narrative: Constructing stories of miracles and wonders around institutional figures is intended to detach reality from its natural laws. When a believer is convinced that the laws of nature are subject to the will of a "saint" or "holy man," they abandon the responsibility to learn, investigate, and act in the real world.**

The Repair: Religious Rationalism – The Human Monologue as a Sacred Duty

Religious reform requires the erasure of all these idolatrous reflections and a return to an approach of strict religious rationalism. At the foundation of this philosophy lies the concept that everything occurring between the human and God is a one-way movement: from the human to God.

Monological Philosophy:

- **God as the Absolute Unknown: All attempts by institutions to claim a "dialogue" with God—that is, to claim that God "spoke" to them, "commanded" them specific things, or "answered" their prayers—are an idolatrous pretension. God, by definition as Sublime and Infinite, does not conduct a dialogue with the limited and finite.**
- **The Duty of the Monologue: From a rational perspective, the human is engaged in an eternal monologue. When a person prays, meditates, or**

acts ethically, they are not waiting for an answer from the heavens. They position themselves before the Infinite, and within this space, they crystallize their moral decisions. The speech is solely the human's, and the decision is theirs. Shifting responsibility to "God's will" is an evasion of the duty of reflection and action.

- **Rationalism as Worship: Reform requires the believer to understand that using reason is not a contradiction to religion, but its realization. If the human is a rational being, then using reason to understand reality, to ethically analyze actions, and to take responsibility for their consequences—is the way in which the human "worships" God. Faith without rationality is blindness; rationality without humility before the Absolute is arrogance. The repair unites them: the human thinks, God is the space that allows this thought to have meaning.**

The Practical Conclusion: The believer seeking reform must stop looking for confirmations "from heaven" (through dreams, wonders, or instructions from leaders). They must recognize that every moral decision is the heavy burden of the human alone. There is no "dialogue," there is only the duty to stand before absolute values and execute them. Every religious act becomes an act of conscious, free, and rational human choice. This is the religious monologue—in which the individual bears full responsibility for themselves and the world, without mediators and without expectation of "signs" from God.

- **In rational philosophy, there is no place for this magical communication. God, being the Absolute, is not a subject with whom one can negotiate. Any claim to "revelation" or "prophecy" in the institutional sense is a human attempt to take control of the discourse and institutionalize authority. The monologue is the only possible truth: the human speaks to the absolute void, and within that space, they are required to define their values.**
- **The Repair – The "Monologue" as the Moral Backbone: Reform requires the believer to stop projecting their desires onto God. When a person says, "God commanded me," they are trying to use supreme authority to justify their private or institutional desire. Reform requires the individual to say: "I choose this value; I take full responsibility for it as a religious duty toward the God whose existence I desire in my heart, and I stand behind its consequences." Speaking to God is an exercise in intellectual honesty—the person clarifies their moral duties to themselves, without hiding behind a "heavenly will" determined by the self-interested religious establishment.**

Rationalism as the Purification of Ritual

Within the framework of idolatrous mysticism, ritual becomes a magical act intended to "influence" God. Religious rationalism demands a redefinition of the religious act.

- **The Analysis: A ritual intended to achieve material or spiritual benefit has the character of a bribe or witchcraft. In institutions, there is a demand to perform technical actions (long prayers, sacrifices, repetitive rites) based on the belief that they "bring down" grace.**
- **The Repair – Ritual as Internal Training: If there is value to ritual in religious rationalism, it serves as a tool for educating the individual's conscience. Prayer is an internal monologue intended to align the person with truth and morality. It does not change God; it changes the one praying. It is not a "dialogue," but an internal introspection aimed at making the person a more ethical being. Reform requires the believer to acknowledge that any effect of the ritual is on human consciousness, not on Divine reality.**

Absolute Human Responsibility: The Rejection of "Divine Aid"

Institutions teach the believer that God "helps" them, "guides" them, or "saves" them. This belief weakens the demand for the human to be active and to solve their moral and social problems on their own.

The Analysis:

Dependency on "divine aid" is a gateway for institutional exploitation. The institution claims to be the representative of that aid, thereby perpetuating the weakness of the believer.

The Repair – God as an Abstract Imperative:

Reform requires understanding that Divinity is the absolute moral "imperative," not a helping "factor." When a person stands before injustice, they do not need to wait for "divine aid" or a miracle. They stand alone, and they are commanded to execute justice. There is no "higher power" that will solve the problem for us; we are the power destined to solve it. The monologue before the Infinite is the source of human strength, not the expectation of receiving power from the outside.

Returning to religious rationalism is a process of maturation: the human ceases to be a child seeking approval or assistance from an imagined "father," and becomes an adult who takes responsibility for their world and their actions.

Salvation as Action: Fighting Evil as the Duty of Modern Man

Institutional religious dogma has positioned salvation as an external, miraculous event that will come "from heaven" or through a savior figure. This concept, as we have deconstructed, has become a tool to neutralize human agency and preserve archaic power structures. The rational-religious reform demands a shift in consciousness: recognizing that evil is not a "glitch" that can be erased by a miracle, but an inherent part of the human sphere, and that its very existence is the foundation upon which salvation is built.

1. The Realism of Evil

A world without evil is a meaningless term, as moral choice requires the existence of the opposite option. Evil is not an external presence that can be eradicated, but a potential embedded in human nature and the infrastructure of reality. Therefore, any religious claim to abolish evil is a dangerous illusion. The struggle is not to destroy evil (which would necessarily lead to ideological and institutional violence), but to reduce its power. This is an aspiration for the lowest possible "moral entropy," while understanding that evil is a gravitational force that must be resisted every single moment.

2. Abolishing Heavenly Salvation as the Salvation of Maturity

Expecting heavenly salvation is an abdication of responsibility. When a person waits for a miracle, they forfeit the driving force of reason and will. True salvation—in the sense of improving the human condition and restoring ethical harmony—is an accumulative process of human labor. In the religious monologue we have defined, the human "expects" nothing. They act. They are the ones who create the "miracle" through justice, compassion, and the reasoned use of the forces of nature and society. Salvation is the byproduct of reducing evil in the room where the individual is, in the community where they live, and in the thought they produce.

3. The Human as the Sovereign of Salvation

Religious reform redefines the human role: the individual is the "redeemer" of themselves and their surroundings. There is no transcendent power that will bring salvation down to the world; Divinity is the absolute compass, but the human is the executing hand. This is the transition from a human seeking "heavenly mercy" to a human taking their destiny into their own hands, understanding that Divinity is expressed only through human action.

- **Redemption of the Individual: Taking absolute responsibility for one's actions, without confession to an institution and without dependency on external forgiveness. This is a process of self-purification where the individual fights their selfish tendencies.**
- **Redemption of the Environment: An uncompromising struggle against corruption, oppression, and exploitation—these are the organizational**

expressions of evil whose power must be reduced. Any religious institution that protects crimes or preserves ignorance is a hotbed of evil that must be undermined.

4. Eternal Struggle as Worship

The struggle to reduce evil is itself the highest religious worship. In the religious monologue in which we reside, there is no rest and no "end of history." The dynamic of good and evil is eternal, and the human role is to serve as the force of resistance to evil. Salvation is not the place we will reach, but the quality of the path we pave. Every act of justice, every effort to achieve rational truth, every attempt to protect the weak from the strong—these are the building blocks of human salvation.

Summary

We understand that religious reform is not about throwing faith into the trash, but about saving it and transforming it into a system of absolute human responsibility. When a person stops expecting salvation from the institution or from heaven, they are liberated from the fears that control them, and they discover the sovereign power inherent in them to create good. This is the return to the image of God: the ability to create a better reality out of full awareness, personal responsibility, and reason that is not subject to anyone.

"This text was edited and polished with the assistance of AI technology to ensure grammatical accuracy and stylistic flow, while maintaining the original intent and content of the author.If the editing is not perfect, I apologize.

2026. All rights reserved